NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan October 3, 1938 Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year 10¢

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PROTOCOLS
by Ben Marcin

DEPRESSION MADE TO ORDER
J. Corr Fitzgerald

FROM THE TOWER
Father Coughlin

SOCIAL SECURITY'S THREAT TO THE AMERICAN SYSTEM
James F. Edwards

DON BOSCO
Rev. Martin Dempsey

BAILING THE BANKS OUT OF BANKRUPTCY
Lawrence Lucey

WHY NOT GET A LARGER DISHPAN?
Frederick M. Baker

CHRISTIAN FRONT CONTEST

VOL. 2A NO. 14

CHANCELLOR HITLER OF GERMANY

KEYSTONE

PRIME MINISTER NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN OF GREAT BRITAIN

WIDE WORLD

The PEACEMAKERS

HISTORY in the moments of its making often seems unimportant, but time's perspective can hardly add to the importance or dramatic character of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's visit to Chancellor Hitler.

The consequences of that conference, with its impetus for peace talks among the nations, is certain to echo down the years as a new method in statecraft.

That Chamberlain had conferences with Premiers Mussolini of Italy and Daladier of France before the Hitler talk, as well as the movement for a seven-nation conversation which followed, make the Chamberlain move truly historic.

The will to peace among responsible leaders of Europe, and the firm desire for peace by the people, may well serve to identify as well as to isolate the makers of war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Justice

October 3, 1938

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Depression Made to Order
J. CORR FITZGERALD PAGE 3

Social Security's Threat to the American System
JAMES F. EDWARDS PAGES 4-5

Don Bosco
REV. MARTIN DEMPSEY PAGE 6

The Truth About The Protocols
BEN MARCIN PAGES 10-11

Bailing the Banks Out of Bankruptcy
LAWRENCE LUCEY PAGE 15

Why Not Get a Larger Dishpan?
FREDERICK M. BAKER PAGE 16

FEATURES

The Week in the Nation PAGE 9

Sport of the Nation PAGE 13

The Week in the World PAGE 14

"Christian Front" Contest PAGE 17

Curbstone Editorials PAGE 18

RADIO BROADCAST

Readers' Replies PAGE 2

Comrade Stalin Speaking PAGE 19

FROM THE TOWER

FATHER COUGHLIN PAGE 7

EDITORIALS

PAGE 8

MAN OF THE WEEK

The Railroad Man PAGE 20

COVER

THE PEACEMAKERS
Prime Minister Chamberlain
Chancellor Hitler

SOCIAL JUSTICE. National Weekly. Copyrighted 1938, by The Social Justice Publishing Company; publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks is required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, LL. D., Editorial Counsel (by permission of his Ecclesiastical Superior); E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted, either wholly or in part without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from Social Justice for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 2A No. 14

Editorial Confidences

Network to Broadcast Communist Campaign

REFUSING the sale of any broadcasting time to Father Coughlin because of what they termed the "controversial nature" of his discourses in combatting Communism, the Radio Monopoly plans to carry 17 daily election broadcasts of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party.

Carl Brodsky, campaign manager, announces that $7,500 is to be spent for 17 daily election broadcasts between September 19 and November 8 over "one of the major networks."

Father Coughlin who fights Communism is denied radio facilities under any circumstances; time for Communist Party campaign speakers is to be sold for 17 daily broadcasts!

New York State readers are asked to make note of the stations and the networks carrying these Communist party broadcasts.

AMERICA IS AT STAKE!

The barring of Father Coughlin's broadcasts by the bosses of the radio monopoly has brought down storms of protest about the heads of innocent individual stations whose programs are served to them by the "closed shop" radio chains. A letter from KSTP, St. Paul, Minnesota is typical.

Mr. Kenneth M. Hance, vice president and treasurer of KSTP writes:

"Whether you know it or not, you are probably inadvertently injuring the prestige of many radio stations throughout the United States because of the statement made on page 15 of the September 5th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE. When I first read this full page message to your readers, the import of one statement did not impress me until two of your readers in this area called it to my attention.

"I refer to the line which reads, *'Bear in mind that neither the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Company, nor the stations owned by the Mutual are available. These corporations will not rent me time under any consideration.'*

"To those who understand this statement its meaning is clear and there is no reflection whatsoever on independent stations, however, as the two persons referred to reminded me, very few who read SOCIAL JUSTICE understand the contractural relationship between an affiliated station and its network. It seems the majority believes that all stations releasing the programs of the Columbia and National Broadcasting systems are refusing to sell you time.

"I hastened to correct this misunderstanding in the Twin Cities by writing several letters, but believing that the misunderstanding is general wherever SOCIAL JUSTICE is read, I respectfully urge a future edition of this publication carry an explanation."

Radio Funds For Father's Birthday

THIS year's nationwide celebrations of Father Coughlin's birthday — Tuesday, October 25 — will take on a far greater significance than ever before. They will mark the climax of a drive for broadcasting funds which, it is hoped, will assure the most successful radio season ever launched at Royal Oak.

Friends of Father Coughlin and believers in social justice are this year more alert than ever before. They have seen prediction after prediction come true. They now know that Communism is not only threatened. IT IS HERE. Christianity is actually on the defensive in these United States . . . They can see the efforts of Communists to draw our country into a European war. They can see the vast labor movement gradually being swung into channels outlined for it by Stalin, Earl Browder and William Z. Foster. They know millions of dollars of Russian money is poisoning the minds of American youth. They are aware that drive after drive is being made by Communist-Americans for propaganda funds right here at home.

Many times has SOCIAL JUSTICE pointed out that $100,000 in cash is needed here in Royal Oak before the broadcasting season can be made an assured success.

October 25 will be the red-letter day in our national campaign for radio financing. Social Justice Platoons in all states are planning social functions for that occasion. Thousands of persons not yet associated with Platoons are arranging local affairs of their own. It is generally realized that every reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE, every follower of Father Coughlin must do something towards this most worthy goal.

All of these social functions have the approval of Father Coughlin and the management of SOCIAL JUSTICE. Of course, it is understood the sponsors, whether Platoons or individuals, must assume all financial responsibility in connection with each individual function. It is requested that financial reports of each affair be sent in with remittances of the net proceeds.

Since the broadcasting season is scheduled to begin the first week in November, it is requested that sums realized from social events of October 25 be remitted so as to reach Royal Oak no later than October 31.

You've Better Chance In This Contest!

IT WILL be easier to win the Grand Prize, or any of the other 158 cash awards, in the "CHRISTIAN FRONT" Contest now closing than in any of the former competitions conducted by SOCIAL JUSTICE. The reason is there will not be one half the number of contestants this time as in past contests.

It seems that many persons are gripped with fear and terror when confronted with the problem of asking friends or acquaintances to subscribe for a newspaper or magazine. Rules of the "CHRISTIAN FRONT" Contest require two yearly or four half-yearly subscriptions in order to qualify for the prizes. This requirement has frightened off more than 50 per cent of the contestants who were in our last competition. And by so doing this requirement has made it twice as easy to win the Grand Prize of $3,000.00, the Second Prize of $1,400.00 or any of the remaining 157 cash prizes!

Of course, the smaller the number of persons in a contest of this nature, the less competition is faced by each individual contestant. If, for instance, the number of persons entered were only 159, every person would receive a prize.

The Grand Prize of $3,000.00 is surely going to be "soft pickings" for some man or woman, boy or girl who has the energy to get the necessary subscriptions—and in only a few weeks from now. And the task of getting people to subscribe to SOCIAL JUSTICE is not at all difficult these days.

Contestants already entered must keep in mind that the required subscriptions must be mailed before the contest closes in order to qualify for the prizes. Many persons have entered and sent in one yearly subscription. They must remember one more yearly subscription or two half-yearlies are necessary before they can qualify. Since the time is growing short it would be well not to neglect this important matter.

Of course, all contestants, both entered and about to enter, now know that one's own subscription or renewal of subscription counts as part qualification for the prizes. If you are already a subscriber, you may renew and your new subscription will start to run from the expiration date of your current subscription. All you need do is to subscribe or renew yourself and get another friend or relative to do the same thing. A RENEWAL ON THE PART OF YOUR FRIEND OR RELATIVE WILL ALSO COUNT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEPRESSION

Made to Order



How a Meeting of Federal Reserve Bankers on May 18, 1920, Deliberately Decided to Curtail Prosperity.

By J. CORR FITZGERALD

IT is the custom of many of our political leaders, and an obsession with the orthodox economists, to minimize the part that money and bankers play in national life. They take this stand, moreover, in direct opposition to the statement of Pop Pius XI, that those who *"hold and control money, thereby governing credit, grasp in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will."* Yet the day is fast arriving when the "irresistible" power of the financiers will be understood by the mass of the people. And this day has been brought nearer by the amazing revelation of the Federal Reserve bankers' conspiracy in 1920 to ruin business.

On May 18, 1920, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Advisory Council and the Class A directors of Federal Reserve Banks held a secret meeting in Washington, D. C., to discuss deflation, restriction of credit, breaking down of prices and higher freight rates. Yet the momentous decisions of this fateful meeting were long kept from the public. Governor W. P. G. Harding of the Federal Reserve Board, in closing the meeting said:

"I would suggest, gentlemen, that you be careful not to give out anything about any discussion of discount rates. That is one thing there ought not to be any previous discussion about, because it disturbs everybody, and if people think rates are going to be advanced there will be an immediate rush to get into the banks before the rates are put up, and the policy of the Reserve Board is that *that is one thing we never discuss with a newspaper man* . . . You can go back to your banks and of course tell your fellow directors as frankly as you choose what has happened here today, but caution them to avoid any premature discussion of rates as such . . "

We find here a most astounding situation. The Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve bankers, having been given by law the power to break or boom the stock market, to help or wreck the nation through their control of money and credit, make their decisions in secret, inform their associates of what is to occur, and leave the people bewildered and broken. Viewing human nature as it is, such power in the hands of private citizens cannot but end in exploitation and injustice.

In February, 1923, the *Manufacturers Record* succeeded in securing a copy of the stenographic report of the minutes of the 1920 meeting. The RECORD was informed further that 100 copies had been made for confidential distribution and the type then destroyed. Accordingly we are indebted to the *Manufacturers Record* for the details of this conference,

Governor Harding opened the meeting with a long speech in which he referred to the need of the farmers to continue their production on a large scale. Most of us remember how the banks urged the farmers to take credit during the war in order to step up production of food to be sent to Europe. And we recall how the farmers readily assumed large debts for farm implements and machinery. We are stunned therefore when we read Governor Harding's statement: *"We can restrict credit and expand production, letting the expansion of production proceed at a greater rate than the restriction of credit, and we are then working along in the right direction."*

Consider for a moment the idiocy of this statement. In 1916, 1917, and 1918 the bankers were begging the farmers to accept the credit they *needed* in order to expand production. Now this man Harding makes a complete about-face and says "we can restrict credit and expand production." The idea is a contradiction, a rank absurdity, and no man could be Governor of the Federal Reserve Board without recognizing it.

Moreover, this Harding gentleman belonged to the orthodox school of economics, and therefore would have to agree with the very conservative Mr. Harold Moulton, director of the Institute of Economics in Washington, D. C. In *"The Financial Organization of Society,"* Mr. Moulton writes: "The fixing of high interest rates, and the restriction of credit can precipitate a fall in general prices, a great contraction of the volume of business and consequent decline of profits, a reduction of wages, and a great increase in the volume of unemployment, together with a collapse of stock market values, and an upsetting of the entire credit system." Mr. Moulton's only mistake was in writing *"can* precipitate" instead of *"must* precipitate."

Yet, if Governor Harding lacked logic he made up for it in ruthlessness. "It is very clear," said he, "that if we find it impossible under the present circumstances to increase the volume of production of the most essential articles, the only thing for us to do is to reduce consumption of those articles."

IT is difficult indeed to enter into the mind of a man like Governor Harding. In 1918 he found it quite possible to increase the volume of production of essentials by foisting a terrific debt on the farmers. The only thing that now stood in the way of continued production was the desire of the banks to restrict credit. They were determined to stop the flow of credit—the *"life-blood of society"*—even if the people had to go without food to eat or clothes to wear. The bankers knew, of course, that credit restriction would cut prices—would double the value of their dollars.

Mr. Harding did, however, make a plea for moderation in driving business men to the wall. Said he: "We should be careful not to overdo this matter of liquidation, because too drastic a policy of deflation . . . would have a tremendously bad effect . . ."

Governor Harding was not the only banker there who thought that it would be posible to contract credit as easily as you deflate an accordion, stopping precisely at the point desired. Yet, those who control the life-blood of society should be competent to know that once they started business going down there would be no stopping it this side of disaster. The panic of 1921-22 with more than 43,000 business failures was the result of "this matter of liquidation."

Mr. James Alexander of New York felt the time for contraction was at hand. His remarks are worth noting. "Unless there is a very substantial contraction," said Mr. Alexander, "and a very definite and positive announcement made in some way, the users of credit in the country may become more hopeful again that the situation is not one to be feared, and they will feel justified in going ahead and making very substantial commitments for the future."

Lest business men should become hopeful, this gentleman suggested that the discount rate be immediately raised to 7 per cent. This, he felt, would force business men to overcome in some manner the lack of transportation facilities which hindered them in liquidating their accounts. Asked if this increase might penalize some who simply couldn't secure facilities, he replied, "I am afraid somebody is bound to be penalized in order to bring about 'production.' A percentage of 1 per cent is not a very heavy penalty in the way of an interest charge, but it is a very positive announcement that the credit situation is such that further expansion must be prevented and that curtailment should be had wherever possible."

According to a further statement of Mr. Alexander, the transportation facilities in his district were particularly poor; yet he seemed to feel their improvement would have bad results. "There is one thing," he said, "to be feared, and that is that if the transportation facilities are improved and commodities moved freely and credits are thereby released it may make a temporary ease in the money market and may encourage people to go ahead and expand. I believe now is the time to put the rates up and to keep them up." This financier appears to have been an apostle of despair, deflation, and depression.

His ideas on credit are also peculiar in view of its necessity as the life-blood of the nation. Speaking of the profiteer he exclaimed that such must "understand that credit is a luxury and difficult to get." Judging from the decisions of the entire banking fraternity since 1930 to date, one would be inclined to think that all business men are profiteers, for the bankers have certainly made credit a luxury in most instances impossible to get.

FROM the remarks of Mr. Francis Wayne of the Philadelphia Reserve Bank we get an insight into the methods used by the Federal Reserve Board to control banking practice. He said that some of the banks had not been co-operating fully with the deflationary movements already started, and suggested that a letter be sent to both member and non-member banks explaining the situation. "It would be very beneficial," he declared, "and would help a great deal in the deflation of credit."

Yet it remained for Mr. Robert Wardrop of the Cleveland Reserve Bank to utter the boldest, most astounding statement of the entire conference. Here is a man who, according to the authoritative Mr. Harold Moulton, has the "duty so to control the operation of economic and financial forces that financial panics may be eliminated and the extent of the fluctuations in business activity may be substantially lessened." Nevertheless, speaking his mind in a secret, confidential bankers' conference, this Wardrop gentleman said: *"I think a reasonable depression in business will be a good thing for the country.* I really think we would do better if we could get down to a lower basis, a different basis, and then from that we can work up again."

Mr. Wardrop's ideas were actually carried out, so that we may assume that many of the bankers agreed with him. Accordingly, the men in whose hands rests the social and economic destiny of our country, feel free to build up or break down the entire business structure, regardless of the duties of their office to eliminate financial panics and lessen the fluctuations in business activity. With such men in control of essential credit we can expect nothing but disaster.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Security's THREAT to the American System

Photos by — Keystone

Distrust of All Government is Certain to Follow the Disillusionment of the Workers When They Discover How Profligate Politicians Have Wasted the Funds That Were to Keep Them in Old Age.

By James F. Edwards

GREAT BRITAIN has experimented with various phases of a social security program since 1911. It is interesting in this connection to note that her unemployment insurance fund, established in 1912, became insolvent. The fund's debt to the Exchequer during 1924 to 1931 grew to 100-million pounds, or $500-million! What happened in Great Britain may happen in the United States. Signs have appeared to indicate that our unemployment fund may suffer no better fate.

During last January, when a great army of the unemployed from 20 states and the District of Columbia called upon the Secretary of the Treasury for a portion of the money paid into the unemployment fund, they were faced with the same dilemma as Old Mother Hubbard who went to the cupboard to get her poor dog a bone. The $440-million paid into this particular fund to January 1, 1938, had been spent to meet Federal deficits. All that remained in the Social Security cupboard for the unemployed were beautifully engraved certificates promising to pay back the money borrowed, on June 30, 1938, plus interest at 2½ per cent. Taken by and large, this means that the taxpayer will be forced to pay 2½ per cent additional for the Government to use his unemployment funds.

It is clear, now, what happens to the payroll taxes as these are collected. Instead of putting the money in a strong box to draw against it if, as and when depressions, recessions, or slumps occur, the Secretary of the Treasury spends the money and gives the strong box an I.O.U. In other words, the unemployment fund is not a fund at all but a place to keep the promises to pay. If it is not a fund and the Secretary of the Treasury takes the money rightfully belonging to the workers of the United States and spends it for other purposes, it becomes no longer a question of social security or social justice but of social honesty.

The statement has been made, and remains uncontradicted at Washington, that the Treasury intends to use the fund for social security, which is expected to reach the $47-billion mark in 1980, to pay off the national debt now approaching the $38-billion figure. If this be true, then the workers of the United States will eventually hold the national debt! So far, none of the debt has been paid with the social security funds pouring into the Federal Treasury. *All of the money collected has gone to meet current deficits.* And it is more than probable that the fund will not be used to pay the national debt. It is more likely that the Government, anxious to conceal its spending orgy, will continue to meet future deficits with the money actually belonging to the American worker.

The question may be properly asked: how will the sick, the disabled, the unemployed, the aged and the widow feel, in the years to come, when they ask for social security and find that the fund is insolvent? One may judge that they will not be happy about a condition of poverty imposed on them by a Government using their money for other purposes.

THE Congress of the United States passed the Social Security Law in 1935. Forty-two countries had passed social security legislation before we cut out our pattern to secure the family against the five great hazards threatening its home and table. Our pattern has features similar, if I may call them that, to several other governmental patterns. Ours differs from the Swedish system in that ours is a contributory system. Under our social security law both the worker and the employer pay a percentage of the weekly wage of the worker toward the national fund. Even the firmest friends of our pattern admit that it is not ideal. They concede it to be quite impossible to create an ideal fitting all situations. They are content to state that the proponents of the law have done the best they were able to under the circumstances. Evidently, they are leaving loopholes for themselves when violent criticism of the law becomes embarrassing.

A close reading of the statute and the regulations governing it brings forward several startling and undeniable facts. *Over two-thirds of the adult population of the United States do not come under the Social Security program. One-half of the adult workers of the United States do not come under the Social Security program.* It is well, at this point, to keep in mind, that all the self-employed will not benefit from the Social Security Law. Their number is legion. Add to these the independent farmers, the millions

SOCIAL JUSTICE herewith presents the third in a series of articles on Social Security by Dr. Edwards. A fourth and final article in the discussion will appear in an early edition.

—Editor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in domestic service, public service workers, farm laborers, housewives and small business men. They must live on their own resources in case of sickness or accident, whether unemployed or beyond the retirement age, or in the event of the death of the bread-winner. They are outside the pale of the law. They are to receive none of the grants or benefits from Social Security.

It is apparent from these facts that the statute was rightly called the *National Social Security Act* and not Social Security for the nation. It is discriminatory at best. In many instances it protects those who least need it. In a majority of cases it does not protect those who require the greatest security. Of course, the proponents of the law claim that they intend to rectify the failure to secure two-thirds of the adult population and one-half of the adult workers. They are attempting to devise a scheme to include the farmer and the farm laborer. They are trying to think up a method to include the domestic worker and the large number employed by religious bodies. They feel satisfied that the millions in public service are able to care for themselves. They have not yet proposed a means of caring for the housewife and the millions who never get a job. That they started a program not including these millions does not seem to disturb them. They will provide for these large groups when they get around to it and are able to conceive some method to tax them for funds which may go to meet Federal deficits.

I agree with the Twentieth Century Fund Inc. when it states in a recent book issued under its sponsorship: "The problem of old age security has a universal appeal, but for that very reason it has thus far evoked a response more emotional than rational." I may add to that statement the thought that the whole security program has evoked a response more emotional than rational. It lacks the elements of common sense. It is based upon the hysteria of politicians who are anxious to promote a feeling that they are interested in the social problems of mankind.

Ewing Galloway

WILL the National Security Act secure the family of the American worker? The average old age assistance from various States, at the present time, has reached the munificent monthly sum of $18.77. In the most generous state, $30 is the maximum paid, share and share alike by the Federal and state governments. The total grants for old age assistance during the year ending June 30, 1938 are estimated at $286-million by the Social Security Board. This includes Federal, state and local assistance. How it is possible to aid properly all the aged dependents in the United States during the current year with $286-million is known only to the Federal, state and local governments. It may be called old age assistance. It certainly cannot be called Social Security.

Retirement benefits under the Social Security Act do not begin until 1942. Then the benefits are proportioned according to the size of the worker's wage and the amount paid into the retirement fund. The highest paid worker will receive the largest benefit. The lowest paid worker will receive the lowest benefit. The worker receiving a living annual wage who is able to set aside sufficient to care for himself in his old age, may receive that which he does not need. The lowest paid worker who does not earn enough during his working year to keep himself in decent comfort will not receive a benefit in his twilight years to provide for his necessities.

In 1942, the worker drawing an annual salary of $3,000 a year will receive $25 a month. The worker drawing an annual wage of $1,000 a year will receive less than $17 a month. Not until 1958 will a worker drawing $1,000 a year receive as much as $30 a month. I still agree with the Twentieth Century Fund Inc. that response thus far evoked toward old age security is more emotional than rational.

The Social Security Act of 1935 is the child of the politician. The fine minds of the insurance companies that have built institutions as strong as the rock of Gibraltar, had little or nothing to do in framing this Act. Few of the "probables" that go to secure the individual or the family in the event of a general or personal catastrophe, were considered when so momentous a piece of legislation was drawn. The matter of insurance is not a hit-or-miss affair. There will be periods of panic as well as periods of prosperity, periods of plague as well as periods of plenty, periods when war will decimate the population, periods of widespread unemployment. The insurance company takes all these hazardous events into consideration. They are called "probables" and are based on the law of average. But not the Social Security Act. Apparently, all the probables of the future were to be favorable under the terms of the Act.

Few of the risks and hazards were to happen after the Social Security program went into effect. The framers did not foresee the recession or slump of late 1937 and early 1938. The Secretary of the Treasury did not consider the demands that might be made for unemployment insurance during these months, and used the money for other purposes. Obviously, it was to be smooth sailing until 1980 when the fund was to reach the desired $47-billion, at which time all the economic and social difficulties of the dependent were to disappear in thin air. And the social agency expert agreed with the optimism exhibited in Washington.

What this social agency expert did not see was the rising cost of government. He did not reflect that twenty-four years ago, 1914, total Federal expenditures were less than a billion dollars—$735,081,431 to be correct. He did not consider that total Government expenditures for the present fiscal year will aproximate the staggering sum of $10-billion, with small hope that the Federal expenditures in future years will be materially lessened. The social agency worker did not take into account the "probables" which have secured the funds of the insurance company policy holder. Like the politician he saw only the bright side of the picture without the dark and foreboding shadows that cloud its background.

Evidently, Social Security has been seriously maligned by its alleged friends. Possibly a despatch from Essen, Germany on March 20, 1932, will be repeated in American cities at a future date: "German city nears bankruptcy. In a city of two hundred and fifty thousand, forty per cent of the population living on public funds." The Social Security Act does not presently attempt to secure more than one-third of the population of any community. It does not hope, under the present setup, to secure more than one-half of the adult workers. In the early years of the present '30s, more than forty per cent of the workers lived on public funds in several of our larger centers of population. And strange as it is to state it, with all the agitation for social security fostered and fomented by politicians and social agencies, there is no hope whatever that in future panics or depressions, the Social Security Board will be able to cope with the situation.

I stated in a recent article that the Social Security program does not eliminate the causes of poverty or dependency. It adds nothing to our national wealth. I am now forced to declare that it does not attempt to secure the great body of American workmen or the major portion of our adult population. I fear that it may promote a greater degree of poverty if a check is not made upon the administration of the fund. I am afraid of the disappointment it may engender among that great number now depending upon it for their old age or during weeks and months of unemployment.

I am alarmed at the distrust and diffidence toward all government following the disillusionment of the workers when they learn how profligate the politician has been with their money. They have been painted as glorious a picture as an unscrupulous promoter selling lots in an underbrush swampland. The day of awakening will arrive. The worker and the taxpayer will rise from his slumber to discover that it has all been an irridescent dream.

Keystone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DON BOSCO

By Rev. Martin Dempsey



A Brilliant English Contributor Presents an Appreciation and a Picture of a Great Protagonist of Social Justice.

It was December of the year 1887 that he walked for the last time, and then could no longer leave the house. He did not cease, however, to see visitors; for as his body was broken and helpless, the mind and the heart remained as clear and as strong and as fresh as even in the days of his youth. From years of preaching, laboring and physical exertion, the peasant and priest and the scholar, and even the comedian was seen again with him as he displayed their talents with extraordinary spontaneousness. The boys came to see him and he had a word for them; missioners from far-flung Brazil, he encouraged them; bishops from many dioceses loved and revered him; and he saw them all: always the perfect word; always at all times the plenitude of charity, forgetting nothing that interested others; keen on everything and in everybody. If there is a secret to the sanctity of Don Bosco; if there is an explanation of his genius and his greatness, it is this: that he could put himself in the place of others.

On December 17th, some thirty of the bigger boys came for confession in the usual way. He was very weak and as it seemed, he would never be able to hear them, but he did it. He still owed them, he thought, one last counsel in the secrecy of that sacramental tribunal; one last word of love. A week later they brought him Viaticum; they carried him to a room that opened on to the gallery of the Church. There, he lived on for another month, paralyzed in every limb. At one time they thought he might improve, but he did not. The last conscious sentence of his life was: "Tell my children that I await them all." On January of the New Year, the 30th, the Feast of St. Francis de Sales, his patron, he sank into a torpor which was the antechamber of Eternity. He seemed to be in delirium, for they could hear his voice murmuring the Angelus and prayers to Our Lady, and none other but God must know the thoughts that passed through the mind of that dying priest.

Did he think of the peasant, widowed mother, living on the slopes of that mountain side in Savoy, succouring and helping the impoverished, frozen, starving soldiers of Napoleon's vanquished army? Were they thoughts of how he had tramped as a little lad to hear the missioner, and how he recited his sermon on the way he returned home, or of how, after almost incredible sacrifices, he was ordained a priest; or of dreams, that were made real when the sacred Unction was laid upon him? Did he see himself, vesting for Mass in the shadowy sacristy of a Turin Church; of a hunted, frightened, ignorant boy, half-beated by an angry sacristan because he could not help at the Divine Sacrifice? Did he see his first catechists, his little band of urchins, and their journeyings from pillar to post; their outhouses; their ruined habitations; their fields in the summer? Did he hear his little sermons; his castles that he built on air and in words, that he lived to see accomplished in bricks and mortar, and high above all a golden statue of the Lady, his Mother, the Mother of Christ who had blessed it all?

For Don Bosco is the dreamer whose dreams came true; and in all the field of social justice, in all the theory and practice, in all the achievements by word or pen, by spirit of sacrifice, that are witnessed throughout the world today: he stands as a glorious protagonist. He stands as a man who brought his fancies down to fact, and who started an apostolate for the scum of the city, that has spread throughout the civilized world, and given to unnumbered thousands, a chance to start in life that otherwise would never have been theirs.

In the manifold nature of these activities, people often forget that he was the writer as well as the organizer; that the man who could preach and beg, was also the literateur that could take a pen into his hand and start a "Catholic library of Catholic reading," or in 1861 inaugurate his first printing press. They forget that the sanctification of youth—now that it is organized and understood—was in his time, and in his way, a venture so unusual that it brought upon him not merely criticism, but at one time the charge of positive insanity on account of the way he hoped to meet his expenses and develop his plans.

What is more unfortunate, is the fact that many priests who could be ardent disciples of Don Bosco, wash their hands of troublesome, quarrelsome, fickle, ungrateful youth. They are disappointed in some early venture; they are embittered by some experience; they forget that the boy of today is the grateful and faithful client of the future. The boy remembers, but does not reflect; and when in later years maturity gives him that power to cast his mind retrospectively, he sees in men who have worked for him, and who have guided him, in priests who have made part of their life's work the teaching, the instruction and the sanctification of youth: he sees in them the true saviours of society as we know it in our own time.

We quite realize the fewness of planets in the sky: so, too, in the ordinary lives of men, there are few Don Bosco's. These are the Captains of God, raised up from time to time—heralds of a Kingdom—they pronounce and they act; they pray and they exalt; and in the course of time, with all the plenitude of her authority, and with all the investigation of her age-old tribunals, the Church elevates them to the sanctity of her Altars. But for many of us they are like the old Greek Feast of the Torches; with the runners racing down between the lines of people; with the flaming branch cast from hand to hand; with shame and confusion to him who lets it drop; with every ounce of energy and with every desire of heart and will to carry on that burning light until the destination be reached, or until the achievement be realized. That is where a man like St. John Bosco must feature vividly in all expressions of our social sense. No man was more opposed; no man had greater difficulties; no man had more delusions: the very first members that he segregated as future Salesians abandoned him. For years his Archbishop thwarted him, and at one time he was out of favor with the Papal Court itself; and throughout it all, there was a benignancy, a resoluteness and a determination that eventually carried him to his success before God and men.

And so with the education of Christian youth: if learning gives the light of the human mind, then the mind of youth must be illuminated with the ideals that come from God, about the ideals of life and work and honesty and justice. So they stride on from boyhood into manhood with a knowledge of the problems that will confront them, and with the answer to the many, subtle, social distinctions that will be flung in their faces.

In 1884, an old Italian peasant priest was told by the doctor at Marseilles, that: "Your whole constitution is like an old coat, worn thin and bare by too much use." In 1887, he was on the threshold of eternity; in 1888, in January, he went to God: a worthy successor of the great priests of history, and the illustrious founder of a work for youth. A work that under the devoted and ever-growing activity of the Society that he established, will be blessed and sustained with the same motto that was his own: "Courage!" "Avanti, sempre avanti!" Words that may be a help to a harassed and discouraged reader who sees this, and who can realize what has been done to establish a social conscience and knowledge among the youth of all times.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New England's Tragedy

ONCE again, man's utter helplessness in the face of Nature's unleashed forces is borne in upon the consciousness of the nation. The problems that, yesterday, we regarded as so engrossingly important—politics, social justice, diplomacy and secret war making—are, in one swift instant of disaster, dwarfed into insignificance. The black catastrophe of hurricane and flood has come upon our friends in Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and the coast areas of New England.

In perhaps no other comparable area are there concentrated so many, or such loyal, students and crusaders for the cause of Christian social justice in America. It is the homes and the communities – yes, and the lives – of these loyal friends of Father Coughlin, all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE that are hardest hit.

The prayers and the material assistance of the nation we bespeak for them.

* * *

To all these enterprising towns of New England, word of the threatened hurricane in Florida was no more than another item in the newspapers. Between discussions of primary campaigns, and the tense crises in the affairs of Europe, these New England readers, together with the rest of America, rejoiced to note in later dispatches that the tropical storm was veering out to sea, so that Florida and the Carolinas would be spared.

The marine-minded Eastern seaboard took concerned thought of off-coast shipping, but felt reassured that the weather bureau and well-organized coast guard could be counted upon to warn ships in ample time. The folks of New England turned to their own worries closer home. Nine days of rain in the hills meant high water and swift streams dangerously close to flood stage.

Then, almost without premonition, the fickle winds veered again and the full force of the "Florida" hurricane struck the fashionable Long Island shore, to tear its path of irresistible destruction up the Atlantic coast. The oldest and most compactly settled industrial and civic areas of the Continent lay directly in its path!

* * *

As these lines are written the fateful estimates are necessarily inadequate, but suffice to paint a picture of destruction that dwarfs any recorded precedent. No winds of such hurricane velocity had ever struck inland so far north; while the floods, which followed in the wake of torrential rains poured onto already brimming rivers, quickly exceeded the flood damage of 1927 and 1936.

The fatal Miami storm concentrated upon that rich community and its immediate environs, exacting a toll in lives estimated at more than 2,000; but, owing to the peculiar course of last week's hurricane, an even vaster area came into the storm's path. And, now, in the wake of the hurricane's wreckage, comes flood!

* * *

THE great heart of America, careless too often in our preoccupation with politics and business, always responds to disasters. Partisan differences are forgotten as the resources of the nation's relief agencies, under direction of the President of the United States, are given without stint to the task of rescue and rehabilitation.

Taking the toll in life and property damage, was the grim task of the week-end, with figures fast outstripping the first estimates.

Sympathy for the stricken, hope for those still missing and unaccounted for, and prayers for the dead so suddenly snatched out of a busy life—that was the nation's Sunday.

* * *

The personnel of vast governmental work projects throughout New England was immediately recruited. The work of rescue and digging out, together with the long and less dramatic routine of reconstruction, will occupy thousands of workers for many months.

The National Guard, the C.C.C., the W.P.A., and the facilities of the American Red Cross, all were immediately on hand, following out a routine made familiar by other disasters: first, food and shelter for the refugees, then sanitation and hospitalization as inevitable disease stalk the receding flood waters.

Thus the nation is saddened and shocked into a new measure of values. However we may debate the state of the nation, deplore social injustice, or plot to avert war in the destiny of nations, the blast of Nature's quick hand—Acts of God we call them in legal parlance—earthquake, hurricane, flood – causes us to take thought.

In the present emergency we are reminded of Father Coughlin's broadcast to the nation a brief year ago when Cincinnati, Louisville, and the Ohio valley were stricken by flood. Oddly enough, it was to these very New England cities that Father Coughlin's appeal for relief was then directed; and news dispatches of the present week report that the Ohio valley cities, now happily recovered, *were the first to offer aid in New England's double disaster!*

* * *

FROM THE TOWER



In the unexpected absence of Father Coughlin at press time for this edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE, there falls to the staff the task of supplying this week's editorial FROM THE TOWER. Feeling that Father Coughlin would, if he were here, voice his sympathy and an appeal for his good friends in the New England flood areas, we can hardly do better than to recall his words in a similar national emergency.

—THE EDITOR.

ON the evening of January 27, 1937, Father Coughlin, speaking from the Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Michigan, on behalf of the American Red Cross was heard over stations of the Mutual Broadcasting system.

We recall that on that occasion he said:

"A few short hours ago these despoiled people were as you and I. Cincinnati and Louisville were bright with gaity and lights. The theaters were crowded. Streets were alive with commerce. Children were happy at their games. Fathers looked forward with anticipation to their morrow's work. Mothers were smiling as they prepared the evening meal.

"Tonight, while the damp winds sing their requiem, these our fellow citizens, suddenly have been reduced to worse than poverty with nothing but memories of the joys that used to be. Amidst the roar and rumble of the tumbling waters I hear a primitive cry . . .

"*'The hand of the Lord hath touched me! Have pity on me, at least you, my friends'.*" So cried the afflicted Job many centuries ago. It is the same cry which comes to you tonight.

"In their name who have been cut off from all communication, and who are almost all shivering in despair, I call upon you, my fellow citizens, irrespective of your creed, your political alliance, your future obligations, to heed that cry which must be heeded . . .

* * *

"You and I, in the comfort of our homes and by the warmth of our firesides, probably have been guilty of more heinous sins and acts of injustice to Almighty God than were perpetrated by the innocent babes and their loving mothers now victimized by the angry waters . . .

"We can never understand why the pangs of suffering have been spared to us. We can never understand why the innocent suffer and the wicked, oftentimes, enjoy the conveniences of life. Without endeavoring to investigate the mystery of God's way, nevertheless, we can take His divine word conclusively that he has presented us tonight an opportunity to wipe out the debts which have been charged against us.

"Certainly we are not forgetful of the Lord's Prayer; of those words of Christ Who said: *'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us!'*

"Is not the whole scheme of Christianity's doctrine characterized and synopsized in that one expression: *'Whatsoever you do unto the least of my little ones, you do unto Me'?*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Rev. Chas. E. Coughlin, LL.D.

EDITORIAL COUNSEL

(By Permission of His Superior)

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just, living, annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with government's chief concern for the poor.

So This Is the Purge

POLITICS being what it is, and politicians what they are, the nomination of Congressman John J. O'Connor of New York's 16th district, on the Republican ticket, will be called a "purge victory" for the President of the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt, who was governor of New York before he became President, and who by reason of his exalted office is head of the Democratic party, does not like Mr. O'Connor's independence. The President labeled the chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee as an "obstructionist" to the New Deal's own "Five-Year-Plan" and gave orders that he be "liquidated."

O'Connor's Democratic opponent, James H. Fay, an old time rival in the district, captured the party nomination by 553 votes. He had the aid of the White House, New York City Hall, the W.P.A. and Workers Alliance, and all the patronage aids which the New Deal dictatorship could throw to him. In addition to which the official Communist Party and the *Daily Worker* supported Fay. At that, the people of his district gave Mr. O'Connor *500 more votes than the totals of both Dulles and Fay combined!*

Thus, if the same voters who voted for O'Connor's nomination in the Democratic and Republican primaries vote for him in the November election, his return to Congress as Representative of the 16th District is assured. But it will be as a "junior Republican"— virtually a new member of the House—deprived of his powerful leadership and committee ratings.

In this, therefore, consists the "purge victory" which face-saving press agents of the New Deal are hailing as more desirable than the unseating of any United States Senator. The Senate purge, which the President of the United Senates set out personally to accomplish, was a complete flop. Of other Representatives and Senators, cold-shouldered by the White House but not dignified with the honor of a Presidential purge, more were renominated than defeated.

So definite and unmistakable, indeed, was the verdict of the people against Mr. Roosevelt's personal purge program that, in the midst of an international crisis when a non-political President of a great democracy might reasonably be expected to contribute cooling counsel, the President gave orders for a diplomatic silence.

No one will question the wisdom of that decision. Had the White House, for example, restated its provocative Chicago bridge talk against aggressor nations at a time when its political prestige at home was in such definite disrepute there would have been the proverbial dickens to pay . . .

Roosevelt has definitely cracked up with the purge fiasco. And it is going to take maneuvering of greater political sagacity than he seems to have available to steer a swift course back to personal popularity by 1940. The New Deal's record is too thin to withstand many more such assaults upon the people's good sense.

For more than five years, Mr. Roosevelt has had control of Government, political machinery, Federal appropriations and national resources, never equalled or approached by any man who ever occupied the White House. He has "had a free hand with his policies, and every rash experiment, every revolutionary proposal he has carried into effect has been as disastrous in its consequences as it was wrong in its conception. After more than five years of his undisputed control of Government he has more unemployment, more destitution, bigger debts, less private enterprise, more crippled industries, and more dependent people with a greater bitterness than the country ever knew at any other time in its peace-time history.

"Confronted with the indisputable facts," says the *Chicago Tribune,* "Mr. Roosevelt incites class consciousness and seeks to arouse class hatreds to shift the blame from himself to the private industries which he has injured by his course of government. He speaks now as Earl Browder, the general secretary of the Communist party, would speak.

"He would drive every conservative Democrat out of the Democratic party and for the management of that party he would call in every radical, revolutionary, and Communist overthrower of government to support his thesis that this country suffers because the masses of the people are exploited by the cold blooded bourgeois."

Aftermath of the Hines Trial

THE case which New York's district attorney, Thomas E. Dewey, brought against Jimmy Hines was thrown out of court by Judge Pecora.

All during the case, Prosecutor Dewey had flaunted the order of the court. Almost from the beginning, it appeared as if Dewey were working for a mistrial. It appeared almost as if he were engaged in a Russian mud-slinging contest, not with any care for the process of law but rather with his eyes fixed upon the forthcoming crown of martyrdom which he knew would be awarded to him when he forced Judge Pecora to consign the case to the waste paper basket on the grounds of a mistrial.

Dewey is not the "St. Michael the Archangel" which the American public think he is. He is supposed to be driving Satan and his cohorts from the heaven of New York State. In reality, he is fighting a crowd of pigmies and permitting the big rackets to go on their unmolested way.

Dewey has proven himself to be a foul ball which Judge Pecora, with Jimmy Hines at bat, has ticked off into the grandstrand of oblivion.

As for Mr. Jimmy Hines himself and the "number rackets" in which he was supposed to be involved, let it be understood that he has been New York's most philanthropic politician. Hines has held sway in one of the poorer districts of New York. His people were, more or less, penniless. Go up and down the streets where Hines is best known, and you will find from his poor district members that Jimmy Hines has purchased food and fuel and furniture and medicine long before the W.P.A. or the C.C.C. or the D.D.I. (Dewey Did It) ever came into existence. No one denies that Hines has dispensed more money for welfare than any other politician in New York City has ever thought of doing.

Hines is not a rich man, nor was he ever a rich man. Naturally, Hines received gifts from many quarters. That he never stopped to investigate the source of the gifts goes without saying. Even though some few dollars from the number rackets came to him, he did not put them under the microscope of scrutiny to investigate if they were crimsoned with racketeering blood.

Mr. Roosevelt, the world's champion politician, has received money from every quarter in the United States for the processing of his political program. From the dives and disorderly houses, from the rackets and the race tracks, from John L. Lewis and from the Warburgs—from a thousand disreputable sources millions of dollars have been poured into the coffers of the New Deal party to elect Mr. Roosevelt to office, together with his political termites who are undermining the Constitution.

But what of that? No one is crude enough to blame Roosevelt for the source from which he received his political dollars.

It is our opinion, gathered from intimate sources, that Jimmy Hines was never in the number racket but was the victim of his friends who tendered him many dollars obtained from the number rackets.

What a man this Hines is! It is known for certain that while Mr. Dewey, without due process of law, freed Dixie Davis from prison to testify against Hines, the victim of this political purge did not permit the full story of Dixie Davis and the other witnesses who appeared against him to be brought out in court. Although Dixie Davis is a moron; although he has been associated with the murder of Dutch Schultz and others; although others who witnessed against Hines were of a kindred caliber, the great question arises, why did Angel Wings Dewey bring such disorderly, disreputable and disgusting witnesses from the gutters of society to testify against the most charitable politician that New York City ever knew, and against whose name no smirch of crime has ever been mentioned? The answer is brief: It appears that these downright criminals who were among the witnesses against Hines were promised immunity from the arm of law if and when Angel Wings will be elected to the governorship of the State of New York.

SOCIAL JUSTICE knows definitely that if little "Willie" Dewey (Will-He Do It) attempts to bring up another trial against Hines, his victim will not be so determined to conceal the background of some of the other witnesses whom he spared by direct command in the last trial.

It is also co-incidental that Mr. Thomas Dewey occupies a very slim space in the political bed with fat Mayor LaGuardia. Of course everybody knows that Fiorello is the boy friend of the occupant of the White House although he claims no more part of democracy than does Mr. Stalin. The point is that the Hines trial was engineered to come off exactly at the propitious moment when John J. O'Connor was seeking renomination in the home of Tammany. If they could besmirch Hines in a mock trial, then John J. O'Connor's Tammany affiliations would be made to suffer.

Red Hollywood

SO FEARFUL are the movie moguls of the American public's resentment of their internationalist propaganda activity that a huge nationwide "contest" has been devised, the object of which is to insure that people will continue to attend the movies.

Some of the "Red activity" to which leading stars—willingly or unwillingly—have lent the appeal of their personalities is disclosed by *"Ave Maria."* We quote:

"Miss Nancy Carroll has appealed for funds for the 'Loyalists'; Sylvia Sidney, Joan Crawford, Miriam Hopkins, Gale Sondergaard, Bert Lehr, Milton Berle and Luise Rainer have appeared in programs sponsored by the 'North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.' The 'Anti-Nazi League' was founded and still is supported by Donald Ogden Stewart, Dorothy Parker and her husband, Allan Campbell, Gloria Stuart, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick March. Friends of the 'league' include Paul Muni, Franchot Tone, Sylvia Sidney, Joan Crawford and Nancy Carroll. It will interest our readers, we believe, to learn what the above named celebrities are doing with the high salaries which a fair-minded, liberty-loving, somewhat gullible American people make possible for them."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week in the Nation

POLITICS

Barkley Job Threatened in Purge Aftermath

FINGERS applied to the nation's political pulse this week detected a new beat: A growing feeling of independence on the part of individual members of the Senate, arising from the President's attempt to purge the "no" chorus from the Senate ranks.

The independent movement, as a reaction to the purge's backfire, was unforseen by the Corcoran-Cohen-Hopkins group which suggested the liquidation attempt in the first place. The movement, a most healthful political sign, arises from the conviction of individual Senators that the President's will no longer is law, and that party lines must be transcended if the New Deal "liberal" movement is to be checked before it accomplishes greater damage.

Senators stringing along with the nine victorious "purgees" this week rehearsed a purge of their own, to remove "Dear Alben" Barkley from his seat as leader of the Senate majority. This would be accomplished in the Democratic caucus of the 76th Congress, convening in January. It is proposed that either Senator Byrnes of South Carolina, or Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi, be placed in the lists against Barkley. Such a candidacy would have the vigorous support of the "no" chorus, and the old-line Garner Democrats, and would be a direct show down with the President in his much-inflated "liberalism" movement.

O'Connor Wins and Loses

Hatchet wielders on the New Deal purge staff enjoyed a restrained gloat this week over the Democratic defeat of Representative John J. O'Connor in the New York primary. At the same time they expressed restrained sorrow at O'Connor's simultaneous victory in the Republican nomination contest.

The outcome of the election – in which O'Connor polled a popular vote greater than that of his two opponents combined – gave the New Deal a 50-50 victory; the first it has enjoyed in the long purge campaign which began with the candidacy of Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa.

O'Connor will return to the House –if he succeeds in beating Democrat-nominee James H. Fay in the general election–as a freshman in Republican ranks. He thus will be stripped of all administrative patronage, and of the chairmanship of the important House Rules committee. It is in this fact alone that the New Deal victory lies. As chairman of the Rules Committee, O'Connor frequently had bottled up poisonous New Deal legislation, with lethal effect to its sponsors.

"Pap, Patronage, Pressure"

Speaking in O'Connor's behalf on the eve of the election, former brain-truster Raymond Moley, now contributing editor of *Newsweek Magazine*, sets forth the principle involved in the purge, and its danger to America. He said:

"I believe with all my heart that no President has the right to dictate to the people their selection of Congressmen. I believe in the soundness of the precedent set at the outset of our government by George Washington when he solemnly refused to take part in Congressional elections . . .

"No recent convert to the New Deal can question my right to speak in behalf of Mr. O'Connor's loyalty to wise and true New Deal principles. I spent two years of my life helping to build up those principles . . . Those were the days before the New Deal had acquired a patronage machine, when it was concerned more with ideals than with the distribution of public money for political purposes, before it became addicted to pap, patronage, pressure and palaver."



SMILES BELIE SERIOUSNESS of the European situation as these Cabinet members emerge from a state session with President Roosevelt. Silence, fortunately, has surrounded both the Cabinet sessions and the Administration attitude since the Sudeten question brought apprehension to all of Europe. Left to right are: Commerce Secretary Roper, Agriculture Secretary Wallace, Assistant Navy Secretary Edison, and Solicitor General Jackson. (Acme newsphoto)

LABOR

Railroad Strike?

SINCE May 12, when the nation's railroad operators first announced their intention to hang their financial losses on the neck of labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods and unions of non-operating employes have backed down not a step in their resistance to the proposed 15 per cent pay cut.

A conference between the groups of managers and union officials having failed to reach agreement, a strike vote was ordered among the heavily-unionized workers, and the most serious railroad situation since 1920 was well-launched.

It is entirely possible the unions will vote a strike. Then the Federal Government's mediation machinery will swing into operation for a 30 day period. On the conclusion of that period, a strike may be called, affecting more than a quarter-million employes from coast-to-coast.

Railroad operators blame financial reverses for the proposed pay cut, and insist that without the cut they cannot continue to operate. Their losses, they say, are the result of deceased traffic, increased competition of other forms of transportation, low freight and passenger rates, increased cost of materials and supplies, increased taxation, and "high" wages.

To correct all these evils, resulting mostly from Federal supervision through the I.C.C., the operators would snare a share of the worker's pay envelope. That has been the only constructive proposal to date; cut wages to make up for traffic deficiencies, competition, material costs and taxation.

The Brotherhoods and unions protest, and justly, that the "high" rail wage is a myth largely; that the workers should not be penalized for mismanagement on the part of the operators, for government interference or for the over-capitalization that has carried the roads to the brink.

Beyond this, union leaders point out that to accept the wage cut would demoralize labor in all heavy industries; would cause similar eruptions throughout allied fields.

Strife and Bloodshed

The railroad situation was but one corner of a darkening labor picture, however. In Toledo 14 employes of the Federal Creosoting Co. were shot as they marched toward the company plant; in Washington rumors were heard of a new C.I.O. raid on an established A.F.L. union, and in New York further testimony was added to the mounting stack of evidence showing that Communists have been subverting labor for their destructive purposes.

The Toledo strike was called by representatives of four unions—Firemen, Millmen, Stationary Engineers and Crane Operators—when the management allegedly refused to grant an already promised wage increase. Company guards pumped shotgun pellets into the strikers' ranks as the men advanced on the building where a herd of strikebreakers were at work.

Far from preparing to settle the disastrous dispute between the C.I.O. and the A.F.L., Washington information is that the C.I.O. now intends to drive on the building trades unions, completely A. F. of L., in an effort to disorganize and rule. Effect of such a move is twofold: (1) To halt whatever advances have been made in private construction and building, and (2) Move labor peace back several notches.

Ridiculous in the face of such events are continuing C.I.O. protestations that they desire peace with the mother labor organization.

In New York Victor F. Ridder, publisher and former regional W.P.A. administrator, testified before a Congressional sub-committee that he believed it to be impossible for anyone to hold office in the Workers' Alliance unless that individual be a member of the Communist party.

The Alliance, it must be remembered, is the organization of W.P.A. workers which sought recently to raise $50,000 among its members to elect New Deal candidates to office in the fall elections. Ridder testified purpose of the Red-dominated alliance is destructive rather than constructive; its object is to spread dissention and disorder in the ranks of W.P.A. dolesters.

C. I. O. Dominates U. A. W.

The United Automobile Workers Union moved forward this week under a "truce" reached with the Committee for Industrial Organization through its trouble shooters, Sidney Hillman and Philip Murray.

Under the truce arrangement, President Homer Martin, deserted by certain of his board members in his fight against Communism, continues to head the union; all disputes will be submitted to a C.I.O. arbitration committee, and factional dissenters are to be barred.

In the acceptance of the peace proposition, Martin called attention to the fact that recognition was accorded his fight against Communists in the clause outlawing "outside influences." Despite its affirmed recognition of the U.A.W.'s autonomy, however, it is obvious that the C.I.O. intends to dominate its second-largest affiliate, and if President Martin hampers this domination, he will be eased out.

ADMINISTRATION

Committees Preparing Public Hearings

WITH Fall's cool weather putting a spur to their efforts, it is almost certain that administrative committees soon will break into print with public hearings on the monopoly investigation and the investigation of corporation profit-sharing systems.

The Economic committee at work on the monopoly examination reportedly is preparing for public hearings the middle of this month. Findings are expected to result in a demand for a Federal Corporation licensing bill, or legislation even more far-reaching.

Public demand for a reform of the monopolies enjoyed by important public services, chief among them radio, will be ripe as hearings are held. Agitation for a correction of the radio monopoly has been heightened by the action of the three major radio networks in refusing to sell broadcast time to Father Coughlin.

The profit-sharing investigation is the consummation of a demand set forth nearly two years ago by SOCIAL JUSTICE. Federal sponsors favor giving governmental encouragement to such industries as the Nunn-Bush and Endicott-Johnson shoe companies, and the Joslyn Mfg. Co. of Chicago, all of whom operate profit-sharing systems extremely helpful to the workers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REPLY TO AN ARTICLE ABOUT THE PROTOCOLS BY THE EDITOR OF THE DETROIT JEWISH CHRONICLE

The T
about the PR

By BEN

SOCIAL JUST

My compatriot, Philip Slomovitz, contributed an article to this magazine. It was entitled "The Truth About the Protocols."

Mr. Slomovitz speaks authoritatively for the Jews insofar as he is editor of *The Detroit Jewish Chronicle.*

Phil is no piker. When he makes an assertion you can take it for granted that it is "kosher." But, like myself, Phil has wandered far in his mental meanderings from the original Mosaic law.

Naturally, both of us have been interested in Father Coughlin's presentation of the Protocols.' By and large I was happy to see the padre from Royal Oak re-present this much discussed document. I am happier still to applaud the tactfulness with which Father Coughlin brushed aside the smoke-screen of "authenticity" to cling tenaciously to the indisputable "factuality" of this document.

Phil Slomovitz isn't so keen over the whole affair. He is of the opinion that any use of the Protocols, be they authentic or unauthentic, should be morally proscribed. He intimates that it is unfair for Father Coughlin or for anyone else to work out the cross word puzzle of modern events and set them into the pattern of the Protocols, which *every child knows has a factual existence.*

Moreover, the editor of *The Detroit Jewish Chronicle* asserts that the Protocols have been condemned by Catholics and Protestants alike as a vicious libel on a people who have been peace loving and law abiding wherever they have lived.

Although Mr. Slomovitz omitted the essential word "some" in qualifying Catholics and Protestants, I am prepared to state that "some" Jewish rabbis and Jewish authors have taken a contrary view.

When asked to write this rejoinder to Mr. Slomovitz's article I was warned by Father Coughlin to avoid making any effort *to prove the authenticity of the Protocols,* because no one is interested in the identity of the author, whereas everyone is interested in the contents of the book written by the unknown author. This I shall do as I attempt to show that Mr. Slomovitz has incorporated some grievous errors and misconceptions of fact in his article about the Protocols.

First, let me quote some fellow Jews, equally as prominent as Mr. Slomovitz, on his statement that the "Protocols are a vicious libel upon a people who have been peace loving and law-abiding wherever they have lived."

Samuel Roth, who has written two books in defense of Jewry, namely, *"Europe"* and *"Now and Forever"*—books which Israel Zangwill quotes extensively—says: "As they (Jews) appear in history, Jews are a tribe of deadly persecutors, and not a persecuted minority as they pretend to be. Through propaganda, they have tried to convince public opinion to the contrary, but facts and history stand as their accusers, even their own authors and publications."

That statement is dynamite as written by the eminent Jew, Mr. Roth. It is so "dynamatish" that no respectable Christian could condone it because it would blow him to kingdom come if he even referred to it without smiling.

The *"ipse dixit"* argument which, translated in the vernacular, is the "he said so" argument, sometimes is no more valuable than a dish of gefulta fish. In fact, it oftentimes smells as bad, as can be ascertained from the following quotation borrowed from our eminent Jewish book named the *"Sepher Juchasin"* which says: "In the time of Pope Clement (A. D. 91-100) the Jews killed, in and outside of Rome, crowds of Christians innumerable as the sands of the sea!"

Obsessed with the nightmarish and fantastic figures gleaned from this Jewish writing, the French historian Guizot, writing a marginal footnote in Gibbon's *"Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,"* comments upon the above quotation and states: "In Cyrenea, Jews slaughtered 220,000 Greeks, 240,000 more Greeks in the Isle of Cyprus, and in Egypt a great multitude of people."

Had a Christian made these statements, the lid of Topeth would have skidded skywards.

But descending to facts from fantasy: I was impressed when Bela Kun, (whom Jews know by the name of Cohen), and Tibor Szamuely completed their reign of terror in Budapest in 1918—I was impressed, I repeat, at the silence and forbearance of Christian editors up to and including the advent of Adolf Hitler to power in Germany.

Then, again, when the Jewish commissars of Soviet Russia (following 1917) liquidated almost two million Christian Russians, I began to understand why all this wicked unnecessary bloodshed, which was identified with leaders who were of the Jewish people, could have produced a Hitler and reprisals which our Jewish people have suffered outside Russia.

Thus, while "some" Jews, including Samuel Roth and the author of *"Sepher Juchasin,"* are regarded by informed gentiles as literary fairies, nevertheless, the undeniable fact is that Bela Kun, Lenin, Trotzky and pals are stark realities who have gained immortality in the pages of history as a result of the red Christian blood which they spilled in profusion to crimson the Soviet flag of Russia.

But what of it? Napoleon was no Jew yet he shed blood wickedly and unnecessarily. The only answer is that there are good and bad amongst all nationalities. He who would exculpate every nationality by putting a harp in their hands and a lily wreath upon the brow of every individual classifies himself as a nit-wit.

(*Editor's Note:* While it is dangerous either to praise or condemn any people, it is possible to prove, by referring to unfortunate incidents, that every nation has erred grievously. It is dangerous either for Mr. Slomovitz or Mr. Marcin to speak in generalities.)

A second point made by Mr. Slomovitz is that the civil courts of Switzerland held a trial which resulted in condemning the Protocols, if not as forgeries, at least as literary trash. From the Slomovitz article readers are supposed to rise up and say: "I told you so! The Protocols are the bunk—they never existed."

Now let us get the truth of the Switzerland trial and relate some facts which evidently escaped the attention of Mr. Slomovitz.

In 1934, as Hitler was rising in power, he was interviewed by a Canadian journalist, and was asked why he had "persecuted" the Jews. Hitler's' answer, spread over Germany and Europe, created such a profound reaction that the Berne Trial was engineered to offset it. But let us quote from Hitler's authorized reply to the interview:

"Give me one single instance of where I have persecuted the Jewish people. But for me, there would not be a single Jew alive in Germany today. If you think they have been persecuted, go and look at their Synagogues. You'll not find a single stone touched."

In 1934, a Jewish society, *The Federation of Jewish Communities,* in Switzerland prosecuted two small booksellers in Berne for selling the Protocols.

The names of the men hailed before the tribunal were Thedor Fritsch and Sylvio Schnell.

The charge brought against them was that they sold the Protocols which were nothing more than literary trash. The charge had nothing to do with the authenticity of the "trash."

Although this book had been on sale in many shops for many years following the war, it seemed surprising that a legal suit should be started so late and against such poor and insignificant persons.

But what of the trial?

Following the Berne trial of 1934, which was a mockery of justice, an appeal was taken to the Court of Criminal Appeal in Berne on October 27, 1937.

The whole affair was re-opened.

On November 1, 1937, the higher Court of Appeal pronounced judgment in the following terms:

"The accused Sylvio Schnell is acquitted without indemnity, all elements which might constitute a basis for the charge being absent."

In summing up the decision, the president of the Court declared that any expert analysis on the authenticity or non-authenticity of the Protocols was superfluous. Moreover, he said that the Jewish judge in the instance of the first trial of 1934 (Judge Mayers) had no right to set on foot inquiries as to the authenticity or non-authenticity of the Protocols for the reason that the matter was irrelevant to the consideration as to the immortality of the publication involved.

Thus, the facts are these: In the Court of Appeal the judgment of the first Court was quashed, in its entirety and the considerations upon which the first judge based his faulty judgment were deprived of all weight.

Let us inspect some facts related to this first trial which was afterwards disqualified:

(1) The presiding judge at the first trial was a Jew. He acted without a jury.

(2) As presiding expert he appointed the pro-Jewish Swiss author, C. A. Loosli, to whom he gave eight months to prepare his case and only one month to the expert for the defendants.

(3) Judge Mayers heard 16 Jewish witnesses in their entirety, all of whom maintained that the Protocols were a forgery and demoralizing literature.

(4) He refused to hear even one witness of the defense, although no fewer than 40 were on hand to counteract the statements of the Jewish witnesses!

(5) The case was so one-sided that a Jewish paper carried Judge Mayers' decision a week before he announced it in court!

(6) Judge Mayers deliberately set aside the conditions laid down in the Swiss Civil Code for the carrying out of legal proceedings.

(7) Swiss law demands that in the case of every lawsuit, shorthand minutes of the proceedings be taken by an official of the court. Judge Mayers omitted to do this and permitted the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUTH OTOCOLS

MARCIN

STAFF WRITER

Jewish plaintiffs to appoint two private stenographers to keep a record of the official proceedings, although the official court stenographers were absent.

(8) Judge Mayers refused the defense counsel permission to inspect the genuineness of uncertified copies of alleged originals presented as evidence by M. Loosli.

(9) The star witness for the prosecutors was "Princess Catherine Radziwill," with a very shady past. Although the defense pointed out to Judge Mayers that the evidence of this woman could not be taken seriously, he refused to listen to the known facts of her previous career. A few highlights of her past are these: During 1900 she attached herself to the diamond mine owner Cecil Rhodes, in South Africa. She professed to be his private secretary, forged telegrams to Lord Salisbury, and issued rubber checks which bounced back to the tune of $140,000. Following this she was arrested and sentenced to 18 months hard labor. In 1914, she was divorced from Prince William Radziwill, although she continued to use his name when it fitted her plans. Later she married an engineer named Karl Emil Kolb, whom she divorced, and later on (1921) married a Mr. Danvin.

(10) The Dr. Schaila, to whom Mr. Slomovitz refers as participating in the trial, was really the Comte du Chayla. In 1921 Chayla was Chief of Propaganda on the staff of General Wrangel's Army. During his employment in this capacity he was discovered to be acting as a Bolshevist agent and as such was arrested and condemned to death. The French Ambassador interceded for him and his sentence was commuted to expulsion from the army for treason.

In his memoirs, published in the "Dernieres Nouvelles," the Comte du Chayla maintained that the Protocols were documents manufactured by the Russian Secret Police and that a Russian Cossack officer named Nilus had said this.

On being questioned as to this statement, S. S. Nilus labeled du Chayla as a perfidious liar and a slanderer. The fact is that du Chayla took the charge and insult with a smile and never brought court action against Nilus.

(11) A third witness in the 1934 trial was Andrej Ratschkowsky who was falsely described as a General, although he never held that rank in any army. This man was State Councillor and admitted that never, on any occasion, had he anything to do with the Protocols. Although he had all the archives of his late father, still there was nothing in them to show that his father had anything to do with the Protocols.

Mr. Slomovitz states that *"all witnesses without exception testified that the Protocols were a forgery."*

In other words, the Berne lawsuit has not cleared up the situation and neither Mr. Slomovitz nor I should use this Berne incident to dodge the issue of the factuality of the Protocols.

Even though the author of the Protocols (whoever he is, Jew or non-Jew) committed the fault of plagiarism. That is beside the question. In fact the whole Berne trial is beside the question.

THE question is: "Do the Protocols exist?" And the answer is: "Yes."

The second question is: "Do Jews in great numbers uphold Communism which definitely plans world revolution?" And the answer is: "Yes."

And the third question is: "If the Jews wish to avoid persecution and to sever all identity with Communism should their leaders not join in opposing Communism which definitely follows the pattern of the Protocols?" And the answer is "Yes."

In his book, *"The Jews,"* Hilaire Belloc describes what might be considered as the reason why the Jews have fought with might and main against the circulation of the Protocols. He says:

"The Great War brought thousands upon thousands of educated men (who took up public duties as temporary officials) up against the staggering secret they had never suspected —the complete control exercised over things absolutely necessary to the nation's survival by half a dozen Jews who were completely indifferent as to whether we or the enemy should emerge alive from the struggle."

In other words, following the World War, educated men began to find out how finance, food, education, transportation, communications and entertainment, among other things, were rapidly getting into the hands of a few top control Jews.

In other words, no antipathy is extended towards the Jews for their religion. But bitterness has arisen towards many Jews for the rapacity of their economic control.

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* admits that Jews have financed nations for war; that the rate of money exchange is largely determined by them; that the Rothschilds control gold, mercury, lead and tin, quicksilver and tobacco; that Lewisohn & Guggenheim control copper and, to a certain extent, silver; that the Asiatic Jews, the Sassoons, control opium throughout the world; that the Jew, Lord Melchett, controls nickel; that the Jew, Louis Dreyfus, controls wheat; that the Periere Family of France, and the Bischoffsheim Family of Paris, together with Strauss of New York, Seilgman Bros., of New York, Speyer Bros. and the Hirsch Family of France, control railways, movies, etc., etc.

These statements can always be denied, of course, but why does the *Jewish Encyclopedia* inferentially make such boasts?

HAVING referred to the *Jewish Encyclopedia,* let me quote declarations from three Orthodox Jews relative to the Protocols. In fact, these three Jews have gone further than Father Coughlin or any other Christion of importance has ever gone. The Royal Oak priest waives the fact of Jewish authorship of the Protocols. He simply asks the Jews to fight against Communism as the best defense against persecution. He asks them to repudiate the Jewish leaders who stand for Communism and Communistic tenets.

But what do three Jewish Rabbis themselves say?

In 1901, Rabbi Rudolf Fleischman of the Polish city of Schocken, now called Skoki, stated: *"The Protocols really did exist, and they were no forgery.* Moreover, they were positively of Jewish origin."

In 1906, Rabbi Grunfeld of the Polish City of Swarzedz gave the following characteristically Jewish answer: "My dear questioner, you are too curious, and want to know too much. We are not permitted to talk about these things. I am not allowed to say anything, and *you are not supposed to know anything about the Protocols.* For God's sake be careful, or you will be putting your life in danger."

In 1924, Dr. Ehrenpreis, at one time Chief Rabbi of Sweden, later banished from Soviet Russia, (who became disgusted with the cruelty of the Jews, and joined the Greek Orthodox Church) said: *"Long have I been well acquainted with the contents of the Protocols, indeed for many years before they were ever published in the Christian press.* The Protocols of the Elders of Zion were in point of fact not the original Protocols at all, but a compressed extract of the same. Of the 70 Elders of Zion, in the matter of the origin and of the existence of the original Protocols, *there are only ten men in the entire world who know.*

"I participated with Dr. Herzl in the first Zionist Congress which was held in Basle in 1897. Herzl was the most prominent figure at the first Jewish World Congress. Herzl foresaw, twenty years before we experienced them, the revolutions which brought about the Great War, and he prepared us for that which was going to happen. He foresaw the splitting up of Turkey, that England would obtain control of Palestine. 'We may expect important developments in the world.' These were the words spoken by Herzl twenty years before the Great War. He added that the events would offer the Jewish people fresh opportunities."

In July, 1930 when the Grand Rabbi of Jerusalem came back from London, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency called from Jaffa, Palestine, these words uttered by the Grand Public Coadjutor: "The Jew appears now to be the true monarch of the world. Empires like Russia, Germany, Austria, France are ruled by Jews; the Jews are the leaders of peoples.

"Soon the other countries and nations will follow *and Jews will see their Red Flag flying over the world."*

THUS, Mr. Slomovitz and myself are winding and winding the interminable ball of twine. Both of us are getting nowhere rapidly. He quotes from Christians and I quote from Jews. He trots out the "Swiss Cheese Trial" of Berne—"Swiss Cheese" because it is shot full of holes and I do the shooting. He belabors his audience with an attempt to prove the non-authenticity of the Protocols. On the other hand, neither Father Coughlin, nor the oppressed millions of the world's population, nor myself, are interested in their authenticity. We are interested in their factuality and particularly in the factuality of the inordinate control of the world's economy under the Jewish system of modern capitalism.

Like Dickens' artful dodger, Mr. Slomovitz misses the point that Father Coughlin and all respectable Jews and gentiles should be interested in establishing a solidified front against the Communism of Russia which was initiated by Jews with its atheism, its persecution of Christians and its hand-shaking with international bankers.

In one point we agree: We do not

WHAT FAMOUS RABBIS say about the PROTOCOLS . . .

"The Protocols really did exist, and they were no forgery."
—RABBI RUDOLF FLEISCHMAN.

"You are not supposed to know anything about the Protocols. For God's sake be careful, or you will be putting your life in danger."
—RABBI GRUNFELD.

"The Protocols of the Elders of Zion were in point of fact not the original Protocols at all, but a compressed extract of the same."
—RABBI EHRENPREIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

want to see the Jews persecuted in America or elsewhere. In harmony with the Royal Oak Catholic priest, I maintain that the best way for the Jews to avoid persecution is for them to repudiate everything that smells of Communism even though this repudiation will demand courage on the part of our good Jews to disclaim and punish, according to the rules of moral society, bad Jews.

The factuality of the Protocols is as well established as is the factuality of the noonday sun.

For Mr. Slomovitz, or for me to deny their existence is no more sane than for a lunatic to laugh at the lid of a red hot stove upon which he is sitting. The predictions and plans and "plots" contained within the Protocols are being fulfilled to the detriment of human society, all arguments to the contrary nowithstanding.

In his article, "The Truth About the Protocols," Mr. Slomovitz refers to one of his authorities, "Count Heinrich Coudenhove-Kalergi," as an eminent Catholic thinker. In the first place this gentleman is not a Catholic, but a 33rd Degree Mason and is married to a Jewess!

Mr. Slomovitz makes mention of the public statement against Communism issued over the signatures of Dr. Cyrus Adler, President of the American Jewish Committee, Alfred M. Cohen, President of B'nai B'rith, and B. C. Vladeck, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee. In the publication *"New Masses,"* (Jewish controlled) on October 29, 1935, an article appeared by James Waterman Wise, son of chief Rabbi S. S. Wise which states the following:

"Jews are not Communists, is the burden of a panic-stricken statement issued jointly by Dr. Cyrus Adler, Alfred M. Cohen and B. C. Vladeck.

"These gentlemen hysterically deny that Communism is Jewish, and frenziedly repudiate Jews who are Communists. Their statement, concocted out of fear for themselves, libels our Soviet Russia and lies about the Jewish people. Behind high-flown phrases lies a poorly veiled invitation to potential Nazis of America to pogromize Jews.

"Let us analyze their statement: They first attempt to show that the Jews of Germany and of other countries are not and were not Communists . . . and, then, that Communism and the Soviet Union are themselves foes of Jews and Judaism. Of Soviet Russia, it says: 'Among the 36 Commissars who constitute Soviet Russia, only two are Jews.'

"Is it possible that the heads of the American Jewish Committee, the B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Labor Committee, have never heard of Litvinov, of Yaroslovsky, Kagonvitch, Radek, Bela Kun? Jews who deny that many Jews are Communists are jockeying themselves into the position of citizens on toleration.

"Will not the gentlemen who today disclaim Jewish Communists, tomorrow disclaim Jewish Socialists? Ultimately, these super-patriots will deem worthy Americans only such Jews as have wormed their way into Fascist organizations and vigilante groups.

"That the authors of this piece of perfidy do not represent THE MASSES OF AMERICAN JEWS, will be made abundantly clear. To counteract its poison and to preclude its repetition, Jews must take active and positive measures. THERE MUST BE A WIDENING AND STRENGTHENING OF THE UNITED FRONT AGAINST FASCISM (PATRIOTISM). And, if by taking full part in the forging of this United Front, the Jews of America write themselves down as Communists—SO BE IT!"

Perhaps the son of the eminent Jewish Rabbi who wrote the above has gone hay-wire. Perhaps he is not so Queen Ma-bish as some of us would like to think. As a matter of fact, how many of the three million New York Jews are religious Jews? How many of them have left-footed their lives from the pathway of their Jewish religion? How many would pledge their lives to fight against Communism as they would against Nazism?

I know them from Union Square to the Bronx by way of Park Avenue. I know that *not ten per cent of the New York Jews would join any league against Communism* to oppose it as they would against Nazism.

Perhaps Rabbi Wise's son knows what he is talking about.

Finally, Mr. Slomovitz evidently is unaware of the most tale-telling and brazen article ever published by any English speaking Jewish paper. I refer to an article in *"The American Hebrew"* which is equivalent to *"The Saturday Evening Post"* for the Jews. It was printed on June 3, 1938. This article intones the sentiments of the Protocols as it foretells the day when both "God Save the King" and the "Internationale" will be translated into the proud and aggressive air of "Eili Eili"—the Jewish national anthem.

After stating that the three outstanding leaders in the world today are the three Jews—Leon Blum of France, Maxim Litvinov of Russia, and Leslie Hore-Belisha of England. *"The American Hebrew"* is quoted as follows:

"M. Blum, *without portfolio, is* still an important character in the French political picture . . . It is likely that M. Blum will continue to be the one to whom the masses will look for leadership.

"Maxim Litvinov, (Commissar of Foreign Affairs), far outranks any comrade of the International with the exception of the sallow complexioned keeper of the Kremlin . . .

"Litvinov is the high pressure gentleman who sold President Roosevelt on recognition of the Soviet government and the establishment of trade agreement . . . He has accomplished the ultimate in the diplomatic ken by keeping conservative England on the most amicable of terms with Red Russia.

"The English Jew of prominence is Leslie Hore-Belisha, Secretary of State for War. Through sagacious use of the public prints (at which he is a past master, having learned his stuff from Lord Beaverbrook, the daddy of all the press lords), managed to keep his own name prominent . . .

"So it may come to pass that these three sons of Israel, *these three Jews will form the combine that will send the frenzied Nazi dictator to the Hell to which he has consigned so many of 'their kind of people'* . . .

"These forces of reaction are being mobilized. Regardless of the action of the Senate which will shake him loose from the premiership, Blum, as leader of the strong Socialist mass, will continue to have a firm finger in the Parisian political potpourri. Russia, as in the past, continues to look to Maxim Litvinov for her foreign policy, and England, amazed and gratified at the job turned in by her imaginative, yet solid war minister, feels a new security in the capable military force which complements the King's Navee.'

"It is almost certain that these three nations, BOUND BY NUMEROUS AGREEMENTS AND IN A STATE OF VIRTUAL, THOUGH UNDECLARED ALLIANCE, will stand shoulder to shoulder to ward off the subsequent strides of Hitler toward the East. The order that propels a Nazi goose-stepper across the Czech border will be the spark that will once again send Europe to smash.

"And when the smoke of battle clears, trumpets no longer blare and bullets have ceased to blast, there may be presented a tableau showing the man who played God, the swastikaed Christus, being lowered none too gently, into a hole in the ground as the trio of non-Aryans intone a ramified requiem that sounds suspiciously like a medley of the "Marsellaise," "God Save the King" and the "Internationale," blending in grand finale, into a militant, proud and aggressive arrangement of Eili Eili!"

The American Hebrew is the most important Jewish publication in America, or for that matter, in the world. During its 59 years it has absorbed the following publications: *The Jewish Messenger* (founded in 1857); *The Jewish Chronicle* of Baltimore (founded in 1876); *The Hebrew Standard* (founded in 1881); *The Jewish Reformer* (founded in 1886); *The Jewish Tidings* of Rochester (founded 1887); *The Jewish Tribune* (founded 1903); *Jewish Daily Bulletin* (founded 1934).

Why does this publication make such rash statements?

Why does it pass over a man like Chamberlain in England or Daladier in France?

Are Jews bent upon controlling politics and the governments of other nations?

The best answer to the world plan of revolution and domination is contained not in the Protocols but in *The American Hebrew* the ink on whose pages is still wet, published on June 3, 1938, (Sivan 4,5698!)

It is coincidental that *not until after this article appeared did Father Coughlin begin printing the Protocols of the Elders of Zion!*

In conclusion, I am going to refer to the *"Kol Nidre,"* the national Jewish prayer named from its opening words which, translated, means "All vows." It is based on the declaration of the Jewish *Talmud* which reads: "He who wishes that his vows and oaths shall have no value, stand up at the beginning of the year and say: *'All vows which I shall make during the year shall be of no value.'"*

In the volume of revised *"Festival Prayers,"* published in 1919 by the Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, the prayer appears in its fullness:

"All vows, obligations, oaths or anathemas, pledges of all names, which we have avowed, sworn, devoted, or bound ourselves to, from this Day of Atonement, until the next Day of Atonement (whose arrival we hope for in happiness) we repent, aforehand, of them all, they shall all be deemed absolved, forgiven, annulled, void and made of no effect; they shall not be binding, nor have any power; the vows shall not be reckoned vows, the obligations shall not be obligatory, nor the oaths considered as oaths."

This is not something exhumed from the tomb of the Pharoahs. This, too, is modern and represents the present American, European, Asiatic Jewish mind.

I will say this of Christians that their vows and obligations, their oaths and their contracts are not so easily brushed aside as scraps of paper. Few Christian know that Jews believe that obligations shall not be obligatory and oaths shall not be considered oaths—even oaths taken in court at the Berne trial or any other trial.

כָּל נִדְרֵי

וְאֱסָרֵי וּשְׁבוּעֵי וַחֲרָמֵי וְקוֹנָמֵי וְקוֹנָסֵי וְכִנּוּיֵי
דְּאִינַדַּרְנָא וְדְאִשְׁתַּבַּעְנָא וְדַאֲחַרֵימְנָא
וְדְאָסַרְנָא עַל נַפְשָׁתָנָא. מִיּוֹם כִּפּוּרִים זֶה עַד
יוֹם כִּפּוּרִים הַבָּא עָלֵינוּ לְטוֹבָה. בְּכֻלְּהֶן
אִיחֲרַטְנָא בְהֶן. כֻּלְּהֶן יְהוֹן שָׁרָן. שְׁבִיקִין.
שְׁבִיתִין. בְּטֵלִין וּמְבָטָלִין. לָא שְׁרִירִין וְלָא
קַיָּמִין: נִדְרָנָא לָא נִדְרֵי. וֶאֱסָרָנָא לָא אֱסָרֵי.
וּשְׁבוּעָתָנָא לָא שְׁבוּעוֹת: ג"פ

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



THE SPORT OF THE NATION

- POLITICAL FOOTBALL
- LOG ROLLING
- GOAT FISHING
- HOG CALLING
- BUBBLE-BLOWING
- HIDE AND SEEK
- SHIRT-STUFFING
- DUMMY WRESTLING



'No Politics,' So Corcoran's Job is Saved

Must Find New Word To Describe Work of New Deal Purge Head

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Tom Corcoran, the man who sang a siren song into the President's ear and thereupon became the originator of the "purge," need not fear for his $10,000-a-year R.F.C. job, because he "is not in politics."

That is the dictum of the R.F.C. which proclaimed that it "had no knowledge of any political activity engaged in by Corcoran." How the R.F.C. hierarchy arrived at its decision is not clear for, when a man almost singlehandedly undertakes the task of keeping out of office nine or more Senators and Representatives, that man is, you might say, at least slightly exposed to political chicanery.

Jesse H. Jones, R.F.C. chairman, outlined the policy to be followed in regard to keeping down political activity by R.F.C. employes. In a letter dated August 1, he said:

BOSS WAS AWAY

"The R. F. C. is a bi-partisan government agency and its employes, regardless of their political affiliation, are requested to take no active part, aside from voting their convictions, either in the primaries or the fall elections . . .

"Please convey this request to every one connected with your agency, including attorneys on retainer."

It happened that Mr. Jones was in Europe when the high command passed on Mr. Corcoran's case. And it happens also that Mr. Corcoran's political'er, administrative duties take him inside the White House many, many times. Thus it may not have been considered good policy to question where Mr. Corcoran went, whom he saw, or what he did.

But if Mr. Corcoran is not immersed ears deep in politics, then U. S. Grant never took a drink and Andrew Jackson never used profanity.

'GOLD DUST TWINS'

Mr. Corcoran operates hand in glove with Ben Cohen. Together they form the "gold dust twins" of the White House inner circle. And it's a fact, not a joke, that the Presidential attention first was drawn to Corcoran because that worthy happened to play his accordion and sing at a White House function.

The R.F.C. threw out Ed Dunlap, Georgia R.F.C. counsel, because he worked for the re-election of Senator Walter George. But they retained Corcoran, because he worked against the re-election of George, Van Nuys, Adams, McCarron, Clark, Lonergan, Tydings, Gillette, O'Connor, Smith and dozens of others.

No political activity?

None whatsoever!

MAN OF THE WEEK



HEREWITH IS PICTURED Ephriam T. Blank, President Roosevelt's candidate, who won a New Deal victory in the Senatorial purge. Mr. Blank had only a vacant stare when interviewed after his victory and remained noncommittal. He is being built up as a Presidential possibility for 1940. (Gagme Nophoto)

Ah! Love Finds John L. Lewis

C. I. O. Head Taken to Bosom By Communists

MEXICO CITY — Love has found John L. Lewis.

This mastodon of American labor who, appropriately enough, addressed delegates to the Anti-war Congress here in a bull ring, has been taken to the red bosom of the "Popular Front" by leftists of four continents.

Lewis growled and wiggled his eyebrows for such notables as Leon Jouhaux of France, Lazaro Pena of Cuba, Vincente Lombardo Toledano of Mexico, and Communist delegates from a fistfull of nations.

The American *Communist Daily Worker* and the *C.I.O. News*, Lewis's personal organ, hailed his outpouring as an "Anti-Fascist Drive." Lewis, as usual, did a whirling-dervish for the word 'democracy,' and lined up everything except Communism as bitter enemies both of democracy and labor.

Noteworthy was the fact that he failed even to mention Communism—which advocates the destruction of democracy—as an enemy of labor.

Lewis remains a man of mystery. Governing his C.I.O. by fascistic methods, he shouts for democracy and espouses Communists. By that method he catches devotees of all three.

These meetings are becoming disgustingly repetitious. In each case three or four hundred wild men get together to praise the United States in their public addresses; plot against the United States in their committee meetings; shout against propaganda in the press and radio in public; plan how to further propagandize the nations in private; rant against Hitler, Mussolini and Franco in public; follow their same systems in private. And then they wind up by shedding crocodile tears for the Loyalists of Spain who are being butchered, while sending wires of congratulation for the butchering of the latest carload of priests and nuns by the Loyalists.

La Follette Not Governor? Now Don't Be Silly, Isabel!

Bashful Phil's Wife Pens Press Column

MADISON, WIS.—Mrs. Roosevelt's column, "My Day," is starting a trend to be followed by other wives of other politicians.

Already Mrs. Isabel Bacon LaFollette, wife of Wisconsin's Governor Phil LaFollette, is in the field with her own tea time patter column, "A Room of Our Own." Tone of the column is definitely "Me and Phil," and is intended to wed the good burghers of the Northwest to Phil's new political party, the National Progressives.

A recent presentation starts off this way:

"Friends often comment these past months, 'How well you're looking! And Phil! I don't see how he manages to look so fit with the tremendous load he carries!' I can only give them the reason I see—we are doing the work we want to do!"

Well, that's all right, except that the crack about Phil carrying a load might be misinterpreted. No one doubts, apparently, that Phil glories in being a politician—that being the 'work' he likes.

'HOLD ME BACK'

A little farther on, however, Mrs. LaFollette says: "I was sorry that he (Phil) is again a candidate for governor of Wisconsin, but since our tradition here is Democratic and the overwhelming decision of our rank-and-file leaders over the state was that Phil must again 'head the ticket,' he bowed to their opinion."

Now, Mrs. LaFollette—a little restraint, please. Phil's a good guy. He's been a good political governor, as governors go. He has his friends, and he has his enemies. But to even consider him being the slightest bit bashful about running for governor, is about as reasonable as picturing a dog running from a dish of raw hamburger with his tail between his legs.

Milwaukee's Dan Hoan will join the G.O.P. the day Phil LaFollette, or some other LaFollette, quits running for governor. If there wasn't a LaFollette running for governor in Wisconsin the good people would think Congress had ceded the territory back to the Indians.

In fact the only thing that would keep Phil LaFollette from running for governor in Wisconsin would be his decision to run in another direction—toward the United States Senate. Phil's a natural born runner, and he's best at the longer yardage. ($5,000 as governor; $10,000 as Senator.)

The column plants a smacking kiss on the cheek of the state of Wisconsin, too. A quotation says: "Wisconsin has gone as far as she can and we've got to help the rest of the country catch up!"

You know, that's broad and unselfish of Wisconsin to just lean panting on the fence while the slow-joes like New York, California, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Nebraska and the rest race up the track hoping to come in second-best.

Another line says, "The sooner we get the reactionaries on one side and the progressives on the other, the better off we'll be."

Good gosh, surely the people of Wisconsin aren't being told that the reactionaries and Progressives are bundling in the same bed? If they aren't on different sides, what's all the shouting about?

OF MUSE & MEN

ORAL DEMOCRACY

SIDELIGHT on the C.I.O. with its three-sheeted screaming for free speech and free press: In a recent issue of the *C.I.O. News* a black headline three inches deep announces:

BRICKLAYERS
REFUSE GREEN
TIME TO TALK

And the story went on to hurrah this testimonial to the exercise of that Constitutional right.

WHAT IS IT?

FOR explosive expressiveness, the palm goes to the Little Businessmen, those long-suffering individuals who finally are tiring of government control, monopolistic control, and a dozen other controls.

In their recent Pittsburgh sessions, the L.B.M.'s took the musket down from the mantleplace and fired both barrels, in the general direction of the New Deal administration.

A resolution against "nepotism" was introduced at one point in the sessions. As the word flew back and forth among the delegates several shouted from the floor:

"What's nepotism?"

"Jimmy Roosevelt!" the chairman shouted back at the questioners.

LET'S START TO STOP

THE Socialists, those middle-grounders who are neither fish nor flesh in these hectic days of Communism vs. Fascism and nothing else, are as confused in their utterances as they are in their economic philosophy today.

In Paris, Marx Dormoy, party leader whose first name gives away his political lineage, spoke with the confusion of tongues when he shouted to an audience:

"Socialists will never stop *fighting* for *peace!*"

Sure enough. Let's get in there and crack a few skulls. We'll show those so-and-so's they can't disturb the peace!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week in the World

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

History Refutes Czech Propaganda

THIS is the era of propaganda, and all the smaller European nations, and some of the greater, are engaged ceaselessly in putting their cases before the world. So persistent has been the propaganda campaign ever since the conclusion of the Paris treaties that informed persons stand aghast at the statements ground out daily.

Central Europe is in turmoil today because the Peace Treaties, redrawing the new map of Central Europe in a spirit of vengeance, deliberately disregarded the racial principles, the economic, geographic and other aspects which ought to have been given a just consideration. The minorities were promised justice, but the promise has never been kept.

In fact, the longer the small nations are kept in a straight-jacket by unjust treaties, the more acute will grow the antagonism between the peoples forced to live together, until the pressure will become unbearable and lead to war.

Thus we see that the Allied statesmen at the Peace Conference of 1919 disrupted the defeated Austro-Hungarian Empire on the pretext of securing "self-determination" to its various peoples. They then proceeded to construct out of the ruin an entirely artificial country called Czechoslovakia, which reproduced the defects and injustices of the Empire they had destroyed.

This new mongrel State of 15 million people was formed around a nucleus of only 7 million Czechs under the leadership of Dr. Eduard Benes, then prime minister and now their president. Benes knew that, by themselves, the Czechs could not form a nation of any importance. He set himself to eke out their numbers by bringing subordinate minorities of other nationalities under their yoke. Although one of the cleverest intriguers living, Dr. Benes did not have the political foresight to see that the more he grasped the less he could retain.

Using various devices, Benes had the frontiers of his hybrid country so drawn that they also included:

2,500,000 Slovaks
3,500,000 Germans
750,000 Hungarians
500,000 Ruthenians
230,000 Poles

We know the Slovaks were tricked into this political Noah's Ark by the Pittsburgh Agreement, the terms of which have never been fulfilled although complete autonomy was guaranteed.

Ruthenia was promised autonomy likewise by Masaryk, when it was admitted to membership of the Central European Union, and later the Minority Treaty of 1919, (Articles 10-13), likewise promised autonomy. Nevertheless, not one single letter of the treaty, including boundaries, the linguistic question, religion, education, local administration, was ever fulfilled.

Likewise the Teschen district of Poland which had a predominately Polish population was absorbed by the Czechs. Benes desired the Teschen district because its coal supply was

DR. EDUARD BENES

vitally necessary. Moreover, the only important railway linking up Bohemia, Moravia and Northern Slovakia passed through Teschen and finally, this territory also contained the only pass through the mountains affording connection between Silesia, Moravia and Slovakia.

The Germans and Hungarians were ordered into this incoherent State of Czechoslovakia because they were the vanquished in the war.

The world knows this problem as the German-Czechoslovak problem because that is all that has been given publicity. But those who live in this area and who occupy themselves more thoroughly with the existing situation know that the setting out of the problem is not anything like so simple as that.

There is not only that problem, but also a Hungarian-Czechoslovakian problem, a Polish-Czechoslovakian problem, a Slovak-Czechoslovakian problem, and a Ruthenian-Czechoslovakian problem.

Hungary, Poland and Ruthenia will likewise ask for, and obtain, a return of their territory and people.

Since the peace treaties were signed, the rest of Europe has turned a deaf ear to the justifiable complaints of these minorities. The Czechs, who are cunning propagandists, bamboozled English, French and American public opinion by their glib talk of their devotion to "democratic principles."

At last, however, one of the subject-races of Czechoslovakia found a champion. As Germany grew strong under Hitler's rule, she began to interest herself in the fate of her kinsmen living just across the Czecho-Slovak frontier. Hope started to revive among the dispirited minorities of Czech tyranny.

And as Hitler grew, furthermore, the power of France sunk. Her downfall can be traced to the ousting of Monsieur Barthou, one of the greatest foreign ministers France ever had. In 1930, France had Germany surrounded on all sides. Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Russia were her allies together with Jugoslavia. She had treaties with Persia and Afghanistan as well as with Great Britain and America.

What happened? Barthou was so absorbed in welding a great French nation that he forgot about the scheming politicians like Leon Blum and his Communistic front and was unseated. That was a sorry day for France. When Germany moved to the Rhine, France only complained, but did not act. She could not because she was strangled internally with dissension and revolutionary discontent of the radical blocks. Jugoslavia and Poland grew cool toward France, while Hungary withdrew from the French Alliance. Italy borders France on the east, Spain lies to the south and Germany to the north. All of France's allies, including Russia, have deserted her except Great Britain who dares not fight Germany's navy on account of the Mediterranean forces controlled by Mussolini and the Asiatic force controlled by Japan, who is ready to pounce on French Indo-China—the gem of her colonial empire.

Meanwhile, the Czech government grew alarmed because of the increasing pressure from the minorities who were clamoring for their promised rights of self-determination. Short-sighted Benes, in 1935, made a military alliance with Soviet Russia and this sealed her doom.

Hitler had seen how the Communists made a ruin of Hungary under Bela Kun, of Spain under Marcel Rosenberg, of Germany's Bavaria under Kurt Eisner. Hitler is the sworn foe of the destructive Reds.

This alliance with Soviet Russia made Hitler all the more anxious to free his compatriots and he together with the magnificent co-operation of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain of England are today untying the Gordian knot of the Central European problem.

GENEVA

Maxim Litvinov's Record Unsavory

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND—Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Russia's Foreign Minister, in a statement before the League of Nations Assembly, accuses England and France of "satisfying the appetites of insatiable aggressors by the destruction and mutilation of sovereign states. Our war department is ready immediately to participate in conference with representatives of the French and Czechoslovakian war departments in order to discuss measures appropriate to the moment," continued the Soviet minister.

"To grant bonuses for saber rattling and recourse to arms for the solution of international problems, in other words to reward and encourage superimperialism, is not to act in the spirit of the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact."

Of all the brazen utterances of hypocritical insolence on the part of the leading representative of Soviet Russia, this takes the blue ribbon. So much so that one feels obliged to put the searchlight on this Communistic "bank robber, murderer, thief, passport forger," etc.

Litvinov's real name was Meier Polyanski and he was born a Russian Jew. During the course of his checkered career, for obvious reasons, he has used the name of Finklestein, Dehtiarick, Borrissonk, Wallach, Meier, Meer, Hinoch, Graf, Buchannan, Harrison, Nitz, Papasha, and Maxitrovitch.

He accuses England and France of "satisfying the appetites of insatiable aggressors by the destruction and mutilation of sovereign states." Did he not assist, since 1900, in undermining the sovereignty of Russia by revolutionary activities with Lenin,



MAXIM LITVINOV

Trotzky, and Stalin, and crown their diabolical achievement with destruction and mutilation unsurpassed in modern history? Did he not have a direct hand in the unspeakably brutal murder of the entire Russian Imperial family, after which in Hebrew symbols were inscribed on the wall, "Here The King Was Struck to the Heart, Here the King was Sacrificed to Bring About the Destruction of His Kingdom!"

Litvinov bombed the Imperial Russian Bank at Tiflis, in 1907 causing the loss of 30 lives. He was captured in Paris in 1908 with some of the money still on his person and was sent to prison. From 1908 he was a passport forger, a spy, a Communist pamphleteer, and in 1920 and again in 1924 was appointed ambassador to England. Both times, because of his record, the *British government refused to accept his credentials!* From 1920 to 1930, he was engaged in newspaper work and propaganda activities for Russia directed at destroying every "capitalistic" country in the world and its ruling powers. Despite the fact that he engaged in the smuggling of war and revolutionary material, he headed the Disarmament Conference in Moscow and acted in similar capacity at the Geneva Conference for Disarmament in 1927 and 1932.

Litvinov speaks of "granting bonuses for saber rattling" and at the same time states his "war department is ready to confer . . . in order to discuss measures appropriate to the moment." Isn't that saber rattling? What do war departments confer about, if not men, munitions, and sabers?

Litvinov refers to the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact as though it were the will of nations. He could tell a lot about it. The pact was entirely the work of a Jewish Chicago lawyer, Solomon O. Levinsohn. He first presented it to the late M. Briand of France and later to Frank B. Kellogg, the American Secretary of State. The powers that direct our State Department *ordered Kellogg to sponsor it.*

Litvinov negotiated the recognition of the Soviet government by the United States through Franklin D Roosevelt. At the same time newspapers in Russia stated that "as long as there are idiots to take our signature seriously and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked and as much as we like, if we can only get something tangible in return!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bailing the BANKS Out of BANKRUPTCY

By Lawrence Lucey



WIDE WORLD

All America applauded the H.O.L.C., that saved the Homeowner from being put out on the street.

KEYSTONE

The banks simply create money by the scratch of a fountain pen.

EWING GALLOWAY

The Home Owner's Loan Corporation Took Over the Mortgage Burden of the Banks. Result: 70,000 Have Lost Their Homes, the Government is $40-Billion in Debt, and the Bankers Are Richer Than Ever.

Down the block there is a deserted house with uncut hedges and grass a foot high. Its green trim has faded to a sickly hue. It needed painting seven or eight years ago and never got it. The porch stoop has rotted in spots and it is dangerous to walk on. Paper is stuffed in broken window panes. On a window a sign is pasted that tells the story.

NO TRESPASSING
UNDER PENALTY OF LAW
This property in custody of
HOME OWNER'S LOAN CORPORATION
An agency of the
UNITED STATES GOVNERMENT
$50.00 REWARD

This is one of the 70,000 homes in the nation that the Federal Government now owns and would like to sell or rent but cannot. At the time of its birth the Home Owner's Loan Corporation came on the scene with glowing promises as to how it would help the home owner who was in distress. Since that time it has spent $3-billion in an effort to stem the tide of wholesale foreclosures. So far as the homeowner is concerned it has eased his interest rate a bit and postponed for a few years the day on which he will have to leave his home because he cannot meet his interest and principal and tax payments. It has soothed, but solved nothing.

John T. Flynn, associate editor of *Collier's*, in the spring of 1933 when the bottom of the 1929 depression was being scraped, was badgered by a publicity man for a large mortgage corporation and asked to write a piece suggesting that the Government enter the mortgage field so that the worthless debts owed to the banks and mortgage companies might be paid by the Government. Though John T. Flynn did not write the piece, the Government rather obligingly entered the mortgage field.

The Government took over a million mortgages out of the hands of private concerns. It took $3-billion of borrowed money and gave it to the banks, mortgage companies and building and loan associations. In exchange for this $3-billion, the Government received a million pieces of paper all saying that should Mr. Home Owner fail to pay his interest and principal on the due day the Government would then go to court and put him out on the street by a process called foreclosure. The 70,000 homes now owned by the Government were foreclosed by the Home Owner's Loan Corporation. Almost one out of every fourteen homes that the Home Owner's Loan Corporation took a mortgage on is now owned by the Government and this is merely the beginning.

AT THE time when the Home Owner's Loan Corporation was buying mortgages as fast as the papers could be drawn up, I was as naive and gullible as most people about the lofty and noble and high ideals of this Government corporation. I really thought it would help the home owner and put America back on its feet. The percentage of home owners in a nation, you know, is a sure barometer for gaging the soundness of the economic condition in that nation. A low percentage of home owners means an unhealthy economic society while a high percentage spells prosperity. But one experience with the shifting of mortgages from private to public hands convinced me that the Home Owner's Loan Corporation had feet of very muddy clay.

The particular home owner that I met up with had no desire to give Uncle Sam a mortgage on his homestead. He could not meet his mortgage and tax bills any longer so he wanted to give his headache to the mortgage concern. They would not have to go to the expense of putting him out for he wanted to pack his belongings and turn the key over to the mortgage concern He felt that if he could not pay the mortgage company he also would be unable to pay the Government when they became his creditor.

But the mortgage concern wanted no part of the home. It was not worth the mortgage they held on it. There was no market for houses. They wanted the money and good old Uncle Sam was offering it to them. They talked, begged, pleaded and finally did a bit of legal bribing so that the home owner might see the light. They wanted Mr. Home Owner to ask Uncle Sam to take his mortgage *and protect him from the tough mortgage concern that was threatening him with foreclosure.*

Eventually the Home Owner's Loan Corporation paid the mortgage concern its money and did it a great favor. All America applauded the humanity of the Home Owner's Loan Corporation and cussed a bit at the bad bankers who had threatened to put Mr. Homeowner out on the street not realizing, to be sure, that this Government corporation had been misnamed. It should have been called the Bailing Banks out of Bankruptcy Corporation (B.B.B.C.) for that is the sum and substance of its achievements to date.

In 1933 Mr. Home Owner was broke and could not continue the payments on his home. The Government was $22½-billion in debt. The banks were bankrupt and had to close their doors. By 1938 about 70,000 homes had been lost with most of the others on the verge of foreclosure. *The Government is almost $40-billion in debt. The banks are stronger and richer than they have ever been.* Through the Home Owner's Loan Corporation and other Government borrowing-lending agencies the banks have been bailed out of bankruptcy while the home owner has become a tenant or found the noose pressing a little tighter about his neck. The Government has sunk $17½-billion deeper in the red.

WHILE the bands played *"Happy Days Are Here Again"* and while the orators blessed the forgotten man and railed at the economic royalist, the banks were bailed out of bankruptcy at the expense of everyone else. It was the same old World War story in a different setting. During the World War the Government lent billions to Europe so that they could pay the bankers. Under the New Deal the Government lent the money to the home owner and other debtors so that the banks might be bailed out of bankruptcy.

The theme song *"Happy Days Are Here Again"* replaced *"Over There."* The forgotten man played the role of democracy. The economic royalist was substituted for the Kaiser. The banks were bailed out at home instead of abroad. Wilson and Roosevelt were most liberal to the banks.

Were it not so tragic for the welfare of America the tricky manner in which this financial hocus-pocus was carried out would be a huge joke. John T. Flynn, who has a keen mind for putting financial jig-saw puzzles together, explains the financial marvel of the age thus:

"You simply will not understand anything about this government lending business unless you get a clear idea of the precious invention by which this is accomplished. *This is the greatest of all financial rabbits. This is a magic scheme by which you can borrow money from a man who hasn't got it to start with and leave him richer when you are through.* Here's the way this trick is done.

"Your bank has a million dollars in deposits. You want to borrow ten thousand dollars. You go to the cashier, tell him your needs and arrange the loan. You write out a note for $10,000 and hand over your collateral. But what does the cashier do? Does he give you $10,000 in cash? He most certainly does not. He asks for your bankbook and in that he writes: 'Sept. 25, 1937 — Deposit, $10,000.' You put the book in your pocket and walk out of the bank. You know that you have $10,000 in that bank which you can draw against. But just consider what has happened. You didn't have $10,000 deposited in the bank when you went in. But you have it when you walk out. But you didn't put $10,000 in the bank. When the cashier wrote down that deposit receipt in your book, he made a similar entry in the bank's book. In other words he made an entry on your ledger page that you had $10,000 deposited there. Push this one step farther. When you walked in the bank it had one million dollars in deposits. You borrowed $10,000 from it and walked out, and when you did the bank had $10,000 in deposits more than when you walked in. Thus by the very act of making a loan you increased the deposits of the bank by $10,000!

"Now suppose the Government goes into the bank and borrows, not $10,000 but a billion. Of course when the Government does that it goes not into one bank but into many thousands of banks. By the process of borrowing a billion it does not deprive the banks of any money they have. Instead it increases their deposits by a billion. And with a billion increase in deposits the banks can make more loans—to the Government if asked—and still further increase their deposits. In short the Government by the very process of borrowing from the banks creates bank deposits—or bank money—money that did not exist before the Government made the loan.

"Now that's how the Government has been getting the money it has been lending to me, to Tom, Dick, Harry, to the county supervisors and the Consolidated Cats and Dogs Security Corporation." (*Collier's*, Sept. 25, 1937.)

MR. Home Owner, the banks and the Government all were broke in 1933. The Government then went to the banks and borrowed $3-billion. The banks did not have $3-billion, they were bankrupt, but by scratching a fountain pen they created this money. The Government took this money and paid it back to the banks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and mortgage concerns, and received in exchange a million mortgages on the homes of Mr. Home Owner. Now the Government has 70,000 of these broken down homes. The banks have their $3-billion along with $3-billion of Government bonds. Mr. Home Owner is either a tenant or will be shortly.

Had the Government merely bailed the banks out of bankruptcy in 1933 by creating its own money and giving it to the banks and mortgage companies the result would not be so bad. But by permitting the banks to create the money the Government made it possible for the banks to eat their cake and have it too. After the banks were paid $3-billion by Uncle Sam they were still owed $3-billion by the Government. The Government, despite the fact that the mortgage debt owed to the banks and mortgage concerns has been paid in full, still owes the banks $3-billion in Government bonds. In other words, the Home Owner's Loan Corporation made it possible for the banks and mortgage concerns to be paid $3-billion and still be owed $3-billion in Government bonds!

This financial magic by which the banks after being paid a debt are still owed the same amount is due to the fact that the Government permits the banks to usurp its constitutional right to create money. As long as banks are allowed to continue creating money by the scratch of a fountain pen they will become richer and richer while the Government and Mr. Home Owner will wax poorer and poorer. It is as inevitable as the law of gravity.

WHY NOT GET a *Larger* DISH-PAN?



By Frederick M. Baker

The Nation's Problem of Flood Prevention is Not Unlike the Dilemma of the Philadelphia Housewife.

Some years ago in the Frankford section of Philadelphia, an enterprising huckster had built up a large and profitable route of regular customers scattered among forty or fifty blocks of twin and row-house homes. At three scheduled times each week, he stopped at the back doors with a capacious side-curtained truck well stocked with carefully chosen produce.

Most valued of those on his long list of patrons was a certain comely housewife who, though duly critical regarding quality and somewhat hard to please, bought liberally from his line of fresh fruits and vegetables, and always had ready the money to pay for them.

One Saturday morning this housewife specified, along with other items, a full peck of baking potatoes instead of the half-measure she customarily ordered. When the huckster appeared with the order, she placed on the kitchen floor before him a granite dish-pan which he recognized as the one into which previous smaller lots had been delivered.

He expressed a doubt that the pan would hold all of the hamper; but the housewife insisted that he try to make it do, as she always kept her potatoes in that pan. Accordingly, he piled them carefully above the rim of the pan and did actually manage to transfer the entire lot in this way. She paid him and the man hurried on to his next customer.

The housewife, pleased at the sight of the smooth and uniform bakers, now attempted to carry them to the basement stairs; but she hardly had raised the over-loaded container to the level of her waist when a top tuber started to roll; and before she could set the load down again, a dozen or more had rolled onto the clean linoleum. Exasperated, she made two trips to the basement, piling the potatoes high on the pan again, and cleaned up the soiled floor.

A few weeks later, the housewife again doubled her order for baking potatoes. The huckster was given the same pan into which to put them. Again, by careful and time-consuming arrangement, he managed to make the inadequate pan hold the lot. Once more the housewife tried to carry the overloaded container to the basement with results even more exasperating than before.

Not twice, but many times; this otherwise exemplary housewife went through the same provoking experience, always sorely tried by the work and wasted effort, and she often exclaimed to the huckster: "Oh, dear. It seems I never can manage to get a new and large enough pan for baking potatoes!"

"No woman in her right mind could be so dumb as that," you'll say. "None could be so short of common sense and ordinary initiative as to leave unsolved such a simple but vexing problem in the management of her housework."

In the city of Columbus, capital of Ohio and home of the State Engineering and Agricultural schools, three days of steady rainfall in late March of 1913 brought the waters of the Scioto river to flood stage. Residents of Columbus' West Side district were warned to desert their homes and seek safety on an outlying hilltop.

Many times previously, the same warning had been given and heeded; but, as the threatened flood had not occurred, this time most of the West Side residents stayed in their homes, feeling fairly secure that again the levee would be high and strong enough to hold back the high water. To make a long and appalling story short, the levee did not hold; because as always happens sometime, the record volume of water was exceeded. At a great bend of the river up-stream, the waters broke through the levee in unprecedented volume and force, sweeping down across the low-lying district with a depth and power that plucked frame houses from their foundations and carried them along. It made of the entire section a jumble of desolation and ruin; and more than 90 residents of the West Side were drowned.

After news had gone out of the catastrophe in Columbus, and also at Dayton where the Miami river had caused even greater damage and many lives were lost, the national and state governments, other cities, and private citizens everywhere joined hands with the Red Cross to speed aid and supplies to the stricken area.

In Columbus, after the worst was over, city officials decided that the thing to be done to protect the city against a future similar occurence was to spend a million dollars straightening and deepening the channel of the Scioto—which meant, in effect, sending future flood waters all the faster down stream to the next fellow who was left to protect himself.

So much for the story of Ohio's 1913 flood. There have been other floods, even worse floods. There hardly is a year in which we do not have great loss of property, if not loss of life, in some part of our country from floods. Some cities have spent great sums to build protecting walls along their river fronts. The national Government has spent millions in efforts to protect the Mississippi valley from flood waters—only to see much of its engineering work dissolved and carried away.

But, in spite of these scores of disastrous experiences, we go on expecting the same river beds to serve for whatever rainfall may come, repair the damage to our property as best we can, clean up again and try to make things as they were before. In effect, we are saying, in the same vein as the Philadelphia housewife's senseless alibi—no matter what happens. we somehow cannot manage to go ahead with the work of making the capacities of our river beds adequate for any volumes of water that may come.

Why has so much been spent for *flood protection* when it is well known, by laymen as well as engineers, that *flood prevention* is as simple a problem, basically, as that of the housewife's needing a more suitable container for her potatoes? For many years experts have advocated flood prevention by increasing the capacity of each river or stream of the country by means of a series of dams, in such number and size as not only to control the drainage of the valley but store up reserve supplies for severe drouth in hundreds of reservoirs and lakes.

Why has the New Deal administration been paying billions of dollars to millions of men to be idle or working on relatively inconsequential projects, spending enough to construct nearly 50 Panama canal systems, without having done more to free the country of the danger of floods.

Flood-prevention work, on a nation-wide scale, would require immense amounts of material and labor, benefitting directly or indirectly practically every business in the country. Every county of every state in the Union already has in service the men who would make good governing committees to handle the work in each area.

As national flood-prevention is a measure for the security of lives and property of Uncle Sam's people, and constitutes a major improvement for the benefit of all the country, returning in value far more than its cost, *the financing should be with money issued by Uncle Sam for the purpose* and he should put it into circulation as needed. *Not one cent need be borrowed; not one cent more than needed for honest expenditure should be issued.*

Someone once said that God Himself would not try to put a quart into a pint cup. The Philadelphia housewife did try; and exasperation, damage and wasted effort resulted every time the attempt was made. Floods have cost Uncle Sam more than the work of preventing them will cost: let us go ahead then, in the name of common everyday horse sense and, striking a hard blow at the depression, actually start work to make our river beds large enough for all emergency demands on their capacity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YOU CAN WIN $1,500.00 A WEEK THE NEXT TWO WEEKS!

QUESTIONS FOR THIS WEEK

QUESTION No. 25

WHY WILL THERE ALWAYS BE A JEWISH-CHRISTIAN QUESTION?

1. Jews and Christians differ in spiritual objectives
2. Christians are instinctively greedy
3. Jews are instinctively greedy
4. Christians desire persecution of Jews for its own sake
5. Jews desire persecution of Christians for its own sake
6. Communism bred the Jewish-Christian problem
7. Fascism bred the Jewish-Christian problem
8. Jews are internationalists while Christians are more patriotic to their respective States

QUESTION No. 26

WHY IS FATHER COUGHLIN NOT AN ANTI-SEMITE?

1. He does not believe Jews were not wholly responsible for the great war
2. He opposes only Jewry as an international economic system
3. He is unChristian in his enmity to Aryans individually
4. He does not believe non-Aryans not predatory
5. He does not believe the Jewish masses are unprejudiced by their leaders
6. He is a Catholic priest
7. He believes there is no Jewish problem Jews could not themselves solve
8. He admires Jewish energy and ability

FILL IN THIS COUPON AND MAIL WITH 10 CENTS IN COIN

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question. Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 25 For Question No. 25 I select Answer No. ☐ No. 26 For Question No. 26 I select Answer No. ☐

Name .....

Address .....

Town or City ..... State .....

EXTRA COUPON FOR FRIEND OR RELATIVE

FILL IN THIS COUPON AND MAIL WITH 10 CENTS IN COIN

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question. Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 25 For Question No. 25 I select Answer No. ☐ No. 26 For Question No. 26 I select Answer No. ☐

Name .....

Address .....

Town or City ..... State .....

RULES OF THE CONTEST—

1. Open to all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE except employes of Father Coughlin, members of the former National Board of National Union for Social Justice, or members of their families.

2. The Contest shall consist of 50 questions and run for 16 consecutive weeks beginning on July 4, 1938. Two questions each week for 15 weeks and all 50 questions to appear on the 16th week. Each question deals with Christianity, the social justice principles of Father Coughlin, or the contents of the SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine.

3. A Grand Prize of $3,000.00 will be awarded the reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE returning the best or most appropriate answers to the 50 questions, such answers to be based on the universal doctrine of Christianity (all creeds) or the viewpoint of Father Coughlin as expressed over the radio or in the columns of SOCIAL JUSTICE. The reader or readers submitting the next nearest correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in the order of their correctness.

4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each pair of answers, and to obtain two yearly subscriptions or four half-yearly suoscriptions to SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine. For these the contestant shall have sent without further cost a copy of Father Coughlin's compiled 16 radio lectures of the 1938 season.

5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names or addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for Coupons arriving unduly late or lost in the mails. By entering the Contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decision of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.

6. In event of ties additional questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.

7. DO NOT decorate Coupons. Neatness will NOT count.

8. Any inquiry the reply to which could not affect outcome of Contest will be acknowledged.

9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of duly qualified answers, and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. A contestant sending in more than one fully paid set and two yearly or four half-yearly subscriptions with each set submitted shall be entitled to have a copy of Father Coughlin's 1938 Radio lectures for each set submitted.

SO CONTESTANTS MAY KNOW—

1. Study the questions. Mark your selection of the best or most appropriate answers on the Coupons below the questions and send in EACH WEEK with 10 cents in coin (not stamps).

2. If you wish, you may pay in full, $2.50 NOW, and then send in your weekly coupons without further remittance.

3. In order to qualify as a prize-winner you must obtain two yearly subscriptions ($3.00 per year) or four half-yearly subscriptions ($1.50) to SOCIAL JUSTICE WITH EACH SET OF SOLUTIONS SUBMITTED. THESE SUBSCRIPTIONS MAY BE SENT IN AT ANY TIME DURING THE COURSE OF THE CONTEST.

4. Each question will pertain to Christianity, (not of any particular creed), to the social justice principles laid down by Father Coughlin, or to the contents of SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine. One of the list of suggested answers underneath each question will be the best or most appropriate based upon the viewpoints of Father Coughlin or this national weekly. It is your job as a contestant to try to select that particular answer.

5. In order to qualify as a prize-winner, in addition to obtaining the above-mentioned subscriptions, each contestant is required to remit $2.50 for each complete set of solutions submitted. THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE CONTEST GO INTO THE BROADCASTING FUND TO ASSURE FATHER COUGHLIN'S WEEKLY ADDRESSES NEXT SEASON!

6. If you run more than one set of answers, be sure to mark your sets "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3" etc. Each set stands alone in the judging. Coupons are NOT taken from one set to fill in bad "holes" in another set.

Remember!

RENEWAL OF YOUR OWN SUBSCRIPTION COUNTS

To Qualify You as a Contestant

GRAND PRIZE OF $3,000.00 CASH AWAITS WINNER IN "CHRISTIAN FRONT" CONTEST

During the next two weeks you, now reading these lines, CAN WIN a neat little fortune in our "CHRISTIAN FRONT" Contest. You CAN WIN $1,500.00 each of these two weeks for answering 50 simple social justice questions better than any other contestant.

But—in order to win—YOU MUST ENTER!

A Grand Prize of $3,000.00! A Second Prize of $1,400.00! A Third Prize of $1,000.00! A Fourth Prize of $400.00! And 155 additional cash awards. A Grand Total of $7,000.00 which MUST BE WON by 159 readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

AND ONLY TWO WEEKS MORE!

Only two weeks before the final printing of contest questions! You can make these two weeks stand out mighty prominently in your life. What could you do with $3,000.00 in cash? Go to college. Go into business. Buy that home you've had your eye on. Marry the girl. Marry the man. Take a trip around the world. Buy gilt-edged stocks or bonds. All of these are possible for you with $3,000.00 in your possession.

YOU CAN WIN THAT $3,000.00 IN TWO WEEKS — IF YOU ENTER NOW!

Use the "Past Questions" Coupon below. Don't delay longer. Don't take the chance of missing out altogether on this rare opportunity.

Time is fleeting. Today is the day. NOW!

GRAND PRIZE $3,000.00
Second Prize - - - $1,400.00
Third Prize - - - - $1,000.00
Fourth Prize - - - - $300.00
Fifth Prize - - - - - $200.00
4 of $25.00 ea. - - - $100.00
50 of $10.00 ea. - - - $500.00
100 of $5.00 ea. - - - $500.00
TOTAL - - - - - - $7,000.00

Let's Go!

Address

"CONTEST EDITOR"
SOCIAL JUSTICE
ROYAL OAK, MICH.

"PAST QUESTIONS" COUPON

Contest Editor, SOCIAL JUSTICE
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

I wish to enter the "CHRISTIAN FRONT" Contest at once and be on an even footing with all other contestants.

Please send me immediately all past questions which have appeared in the contest to date.

MY NAME IS .....

MY ADDRESS IS .....

CITY OR TOWN ..... STATE .....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON REMOVING FOOD TAXES

To the Editor:

I see that Father Coughlin in the last issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE has given American labor something to fight for in his slogan: "Take the tax off food."

The farmers, if they are wise, should also adopt the same slogan, and their mysterious surpluses would disappear like ice before the sun.

It reminded me of a debate in the British Parliament a short time ago. Tory Captain Balfour called attention to the great growth of national expenditure on social services, and ended by saying: "Not more than a pint can be gotten out of a pint pot."

Socialist M. Ridley moved labor's full acceptance of the "pint pot" limitations, and admitted that the social services cost a deal of the taxpayers' money.

If American labor has not more horse sense than British labor has, why then I am afraid Father Coughlin's new slogan will be wasted in a North Dakota dust storm. Of course, this acceptance of the theory of taxation caused a storm in the English union ranks, and one member voiced his opinion thus:

"What is this pint of taxes made of? Bits of paper notes and cheques. Further, they are bits of paper that were issued to finance the making of cheese, boots and bacon, and they were distributed as wages to the people who produced these goods so that these people could collectively buy what they have produced.

"But when the money is taken from them in taxes they cannot buy cheese, boots and bacon. They go without, and the shopkeeper suffers too. The taxes go to repay the interest to the financier who has lent the money to finance the wages and so on.

"If there can be a defense loan there can be a milk loan. *If there can be a gas mask loan, there can be a coal loan, a bread loan, or a housing loan.* Labor's message should be this: We do not want to borrow any capitalist's money and tax ourselves to pay him interest. We can create our own money if we repeal the bank charter, and take away from the bank the monopoly of creating all money. We want our own money."

If we all wait much longer *we shall be forced to borrow international money issued from one world center of finance,* and it will be then too late to stop a world dictatorship of money and taxation.

H. C. B. Colvill.

Missoula, Mont.

UNITY MUCH NEEDED

To the Editor:

I refer to the recent article "Fidelity Needed" by Rev. W. J. Randall, C.M.S., regarding leakage. If the many religious leaders were interested in the worldly welfare of the people, there would be very little leakage. I do not mean to turn the churches into a political forum. There are other ways of informing the people.

To love God and to love your neighbor is the greatest commandment. Do these leaders show love for their neighbor when they permit the people to stumble into conditions brought about by the greedy and the selfish? There would not be a war in Spain today if the worldy welfare of the people had not been neglected.

To see the abundance with which God has blessed us, and then to realize we live in an atmosphere of "dog eat dog." This in a world of many creeds and many more religious leaders. It appears that they lack the courage to help fight the battles of God's people.

F. C. Stanford.

Chicago, Ill.

FOLKS SHOULD READ IT AGAIN

To the Editor:

Viewing the situation from the sidelines, and from all that is coming to the people from the independent press and through the radio, it is difficult to understand why labor, in all departments including the disinherited farmers, and small business men do not comprehend their mutual interest and make common political cause against their exploiters and oppressors. Why they do not see the necessity of forgetting all former political affiliations and declare political war to the finish.

We ought to revive the custom of reading in forum the Declaration of Independence at each recurring anniversary of the birth of that illustrious charter of American liberty.

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men were created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form (or practice) of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

These words should now be burned into the hearts and souls of the oppressed and deluded, if we are ever to have a "new birth of freedom, and government of the people, for the people and by the people" is not to perish from the earth.

Patrick Tangent.

Findlay, Ohio.

INSTIGATORS OF COMMUNISM

To the Editor:

I cannot see why there should be so much fear from Communism in this country; and why nothing concrete and rational is being done about it. It is a positively known fact that the Jews of the world are usually the first instigators of Communism among the Christian masses; and yet we are admitting more Jews into this country. Personally, I am not a hater of any racial group. God knows my own racial group has been and is hated enough—I do not know why. I mean the Polish people, who constitute one of the most solid Roman Catholic groups in the world; for among about 45 million Poles all over the world, approximately 70 per cent of them are Roman Catholics.

Having been one of the young volunteers from America in 1917, together with my only brother, I have seen with my own eyes the so-called Bolshevist might on the Russian-Polish front around Kiev. Yet very few people in this country realize how Poland was devastated and destroyed during the last war—there was nothing left. Well, I don't want to harp about it, but only those who were there know what awful things they saw.

Still it was Poland and Poland alone at that time that had so bravely defeated and stopped Communism. Of the millions of her heroes that during the centuries of civilization had died for Christianity, none ever received proper credit for it — especially here in America. No one knows why.

John F. Nisson.

Chicago, Ill.

NO SUCCESS WITHOUT CO-OPERATION

To the Editor:

I read the article a few weeks ago in which the forming of a "United Christian Front in the United States" was suggested. While I am in sympathy with such a movement, I question whether or not it would be successful.

In this respect we could learn much from our enemies, according to the findings of the Dies committee on un-Americanism. The Communists have a fairly well united popular front in the United States.

They have organized many societies of various shades of radicalism from pink to deep red, in education, youth, labor and other groups, united together for one purpose—to overthrow Christianity, the present social order, and the government of the United States.

We have many Christian societies, but of various opinions and ideas of Christian activity, until we can blend these together into some definite program of Christian activity, we will never be successful in forming a Christian front.

We must have unity, harmony and co-operation to be successful, banish all prejudice, jealousy from the ranks of the followers of Christ, and practice what we preach.

George P. Ratte.

Washington, D. C.

KEEP OUT FOREIGN DOLESTERS

To the Editor:

At a recent meeting of the intergovernmental refugee committee in London, Mr. Myron C. Taylor, the United States' spokesman, estimated that help is required for 660,000 persons in Greater Germany (75,000 Catholics, 285,000 non-Aryan Christians, and 300,000 Jews). Unaided, he said, it would take these people 16 years to find homes elsewhere. The problem was stated as being twofold. The refugees must first be moved out of Germany with some of their own resources, then homes must be found for them elsewhere.

The United States, which took the initiative in setting up the committee, has agreed to take its legal quota of 27,000 refugees in the present fiscal period (July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939).

At the present time there is in vogue, in certain quarters, a method which I believe is very dangerous—that of permitting refugees to enter this country in the custody of their relatives upon the promise that these relatives will give the refugees a home and after they have become accustomed to our customs, either to give the refugee employment or assist him in securing employment.

I believe that this procedure is economically unsound. If the relative has a position to fill, it should first be offered to an unemployed citizen. If the relative does not have a position to offer, the refugee will be placed in active competition with our own unemployed. This, I fear, will have a strong tendency to bring the rate of wages to a still lower level, and with it lower the level of living conditions.

We have no guarantee that the relative of the refugee will give him a home indefinitely and in the event that no employment can be found for the refugee, he will, as soon as eligible, make application for public relief. It is my candid opinion that many of the refugees will be assisted in entering this country with just such an idea as this in mind.

Arthur Knauft.

New York, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN CO-OPERATION

TO THE EDITOR:

To bring the masses of our people back to basic Christianity, there is nothing more needed than a real Christian co-operative movement. Even more than the Guild system and the Corporative state, is the Christian co-operative idea necessary to place our people satisfactorily in the modern economic scheme of things.

Why should we in the United States wait for dire want and despair before getting under way with an American co-operative?

Jersey City, N. J. S. A. GILLEN

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMRADE STALIN Speaking



YOUR fellow-Communists in Russia salute you on this anniversary of the October Revolution. What success has been ours! From a small, but effective beginning on the Nevsky Prospect, we have in 20 years extended our tentacles around the world. We have banished God from the minds and lives of hundreds of millions. We have quelled the silly story of Christ in half the earth. Of course, it was necessary in the process to "liquidate" some fifteen million Christians but, in the lexicon of Communism, results are all that count.

Your Communist associates in Russia deeply appreciate the great work you are doing for the cause in the United States. We must never forget we are not nationalists, but internationalists. We must never cease to belittle the efforts of representative government wherever we find it. We must insult the memory of so-called national heroes. We must laugh at sentimental affections people bear to their national heritages. By hypocrisy, deceit and double-dealing we must insinuate ourselves into all social, economic and labor organizations so that we can destroy them and assume power.

Such obstacles as the Catholic Church, the Protestant Church, parochial schools, seminaries, Christian lay organizations, must be swept away. Their leaders must be liquidated; their houses of worship and assemblage destroyed, their property confiscated to the International State of Communism.

Russia stands squarely with you, American comrades. Millions of roubles, graciously given us by the mujiks of Russia, are steadily on their way to aid in the great fight for a dictatorship of the proletariat and collective security in America.

Keep always before you the words of your great leader, Earl Browder: "We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad." Go forward to victory.

▼ ▼ ▼

What is your answer, Mr., Mrs. or Miss American Citizen?

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., INC.
Royal Oak, Michigan.

I wish to contribute to the 1938-39 Broadcasting Fund so that Father Coughlin may continue to spread principles of social justice in America.

I hereby pledge the sum of $ ..... which I am enclosing herewith or which I will send in two equal monthly remittances.

My Name Is .....

My Address Is .....

City or Town ..... State .....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin



THE MAN OF THE WEEK

THE man of this week is caught in the middle.

As a railroad man he represents a craft that has had a great stake in the building of the nation. His industry—transportation—welded together the separate halves of the United States. His unions—the Brotherhoods together with the A.F.L. craft unions—have brought his standard of living to a level that is typically American.

But now the railroads are in trouble. They are losing money, and they are asking him to take the rap. They are asking him to submit to a 15 per cent wage cut; forego his position as wage pace-setter for the nation and shoulder the losses facing the roads.

But the railroad man cannot do this. The railroad man cannot permit his wage level to tumble, for he knows those of the other heavy industries will follow, or the same shallow pretense. And why should he dig into his purse to pay the railroad losses? The crisis is not of his doing. He merely works the roads. He doesn't manage them.

No less an authority than J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railways has placed the blame for the railroad crisis where it belongs—on the carriers themselves and on government-imposed regulation that freezes free competition.

Senator Borah hinted at a method to prevent rail labor from taking a disastrous cut, and to prevent the roads going "through the wringer." He asks bondholders to take the cut—a slash from 6 to 3 percent in their interest rates. And he asks further assistance from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The railroad man doesn't want a strike. He wants only continuing employment at a wage level consonant with the American standard. He wants to continue living as he has been proud to live—as "a Railroad Man."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED